This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

WIDENER LIBRARY
HX 1446 S
3 2044 010 011 880

Br 2050.295
A

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

THIS VOLUME IS FROM
THE LIBRARY OF
GAMALIEL BRADFORD VI,
1863–1932, BIOGRAPHER AND ESSAYIST,
GIVEN BY HELEN F. BRADFORD
MAY 24, 1942

J. F. Bradford

Wellesley Hills Mass

May 1/25



John Lord Hervey.

MEMOIRS

OF

THE REIGN OF

GEORGE THE SECOND,

FROM

HIS ACCESSION TO THE DEATH

OF

QUEEN CAROLINE.

BY JOHN, LORD HERVEY.

EDITED,

FROM THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT AT ICKWORTH,

BY

THE RIGHT HON. JOHN WILSON CROKER,
LL.D., F.R.S.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.
1848.

B1 2050.295 A

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
FROM THE LIBRARY OF
GAMALIEL BRADFORD VI
MAY 24, 1942

London: Printed by William Clowes and Sons, Stamford Street.

104
47-109
7

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

Prefatory and Biographical Notice . . . . . Page ix

CHAPTER I.

Introduction—State and Views of Parties at the death of George I.: Whigs, Tories, Hanoverians, Jacobites—Characters of Pulteney, Bolingbroke, Walpole, and Wyndham 1

CHAPTER II.

Accession of George II.—Sir Spencer Compton designated as First Minister—His incapacity and blunders—Aspect of the Court—Walpole supported by the Queen, and continued in office—Hervey's attachment to Walpole—Civil List and Queen's Jointure settled—Few official changes—Sir William Yonge—Lord Berkeley—Lord Torrington—The battle of Cape Passaro—Motives of the King's adoption of Walpole—Mrs. Howard—Mary Bellenden—Superior influence of the Queen . 30

CHAPTER III.

Foreign affairs—The Quadruple Alliance—Duke of Ripperda—Treaty of Vienna of 1725—Treaty of Hanover—State of France—Louis XV.—Cardinal Fleury—The King of Prussia—Forces of the respective parties to the Treaties 66

CHAPTER IV.

New Parliament—The Coronation—Creation of Peers—Mrs. Clayton—Queen's Management of the King—Libels—Character of Lord Scarborough and of Lord Chesterfield compared 88

CHAPTER V.

Meeting of Parliament—Speaker Onslow—Iniquitous decision of Election Petitions—Preliminary Articles of Peace—Vote of Credit—Sir Thomas Hanmer—Congress of Soissons—Rupture between Walpole and Townshend—Its causes—Character of Townshend—Houghton—Townshend Party—Miss Skerrett 100

CHAPTER VI.

Complaints against Spain—The Beggars' Opera—Duchess of Queensberry forbidden the Court—Deficiency in the Civil List—Sir Paul Methuen—Dispute between George II. and the King of Prussia—Royal duel—Lord Hervey's return from Italy—His political position—Breaks with Mr. Pulteney—Treaty of Seville—Debate on the Hessian Troops—Debate on Dunkirk, and Lord Hervey's Pamphlet—Townshend resigns—Lord Hervey Vice-Chamberlain . . . . . Page 119

CHAPTER VII.

Attempt of the Dissenters to repeal the Test and Corporation Acts—Walpole wishes to suppress it—Engages the Queen to induce Bishop Hoadley to dissuade the Dissenters—Hoadley's difficulties—Walpole's arguments—Negotiation between the Dissenters and the Cabinet . 144

CHAPTER VIII.

The Excise Scheme—Alarm of the Country—Walpole's resolution—Session of Parliament—The Army voted—Cabal of the Lords—Lord Stair's Remonstrance with the Queen—Queen's Reply—Repeated to Lord Hervey—General clamours against the Excise—Popular delusion . 159

CHAPTER IX.

Mobs at Westminster—The Excise unpopular in the House—Majorities decrease—Anxiety of the King—His views of Government—Influenced by the Queen—Lord Scarborough's remonstrance—Walpole hesitates, and offers to retire—Spirit of the King and Queen—Opposition at Court—Her notions of official discipline—The Excise Scheme abandoned—Riots—Complained of in Parliament, and turned to the advantage of the Minister 179

CHAPTER X.

Walpole resolves to punish official mutineers—Lords Chesterfield and Clinton dismissed—Character of the other Ministers and Courtiers—The Prince of Wales and his Friends hostile—Walpole assembles his Party and harangues them—Triumph in the Commons—South Sea Question in the Lords—Deserters—Bishop Hoadley 206

CHAPTER XI.

Efforts of the Court to obtain a Majority in the Peers—The Queen and Bishop Hoadley—Marriage of Princess Royal—Portrait of the Prince of Orange—Dissatisfaction of the Prince of Wales—Defeat of Ministers in the Lords on the South Sea affair—The Opposition go too far—Are checked, and sign offensive Protests—Lord Hervey called to the House of Peers—The Session closes, and the Court goes out of Town . 229

CHAPTER XII.

Affairs of Poland—Rival claims of the Elector of Saxony and Stanislaus Leczinski—The Emperor and the Czarina support the former, France the latter—Stanislaus elected by intrigue and violence—Approved by Lord Hervey and Walpole, but distasteful to the King and Newcastle—Stanislaus expelled, and Augustus elected—War between France and the Emperor—Treaty between France and Savoy—Opinion of George II. on it—The French seize Lorraine—Royal Hunting—Lord Hervey's intercourse and conversation with the King and Queen—Advocates neutrality: so does Walpole—Negotiation in London between the Emperor and Spain—Delays of the Emperor—Spain concludes with France—The Emperor loses Italy . . . . . Page 247

CHAPTER XIII.

Marriage of Princess Royal—Arrival of Prince of Orange—King's treatment of him—Lord Hervey reports ill of his person, but well of his mind—Behaviour of the Princess—Prince falls dangerously ill—Prince of Wales's dissension with the King—His revenue—Lord Hervey's advice—The Queen's answer—King's Speech—Lord Hervey moves the Address—New Peerages—Lord Chancellor Talbot—Lord Chief-Justice Hardwicke—Lord Chancellor King—Dukes of Marlborough and Bedford—Bill to make Army Commissions for life—King's ungiving disposition—Duke of Richmond—"Court Drudge"—Further particulars of the Queen's character and conduct 271

CHAPTER XIV.

Proceedings in Parliament—The Prince of Wales's Affairs and his Character—Increase of the Army—Vote of Confidence—Lord Hervey disapproves of both—High state of Literature—Marriage of the Princess Royal—Figure of the Bridegroom—Pretensions of the Irish Peers—Horace Walpole—End of the Session—Speaker Onslow Treasurer of the Navy—Lord Stair dismissed—Prince and Princess of Orange depart—Miss Vane—Elections—Dissatisfaction of the King and Queen—Lord Isla and the Duke of Argyle 296

CHAPTER XV.

Foreign affairs—War on the Continent—Campaign in Italy—Pretender in the Spanish army—Conquest of Sicily—Historical Account of Sicily—Battles of Parma and Guastalla—War in Germany—Siege of Philipsburg—Siege and surrender of Dantzic—Gallantry of Count Plélo—Flight of King Stanislaus—Policy of Cardinal Fleury and of Sir Robert Walpole—Counteracted by Hatolf and the Hanoverian Interest, and by the Queen—Opinion of the English Ministers—Character of Count Kinski—Peace preserved 338

CHAPTER XVI.

Increased Favour of Lord Hervey—Addresses a Political Letter to the Queen—Mission of M. Wasner—Extraordinary History and Proceedings of Strickland, Bishop of Namur—Lord Hervey's Conference with Sir R. Walpole—Walpole's Management of the King and Queen—Apology for Egotism—Sir R. Walpole's System of Government . . Page 382

CHAPTER XVII.

Reception of the Prince and Princess of Orange in Holland—Horace Walpole's unsuccessful Negotiations—Details and tracasseries about the Princess of Orange's lying-in—She sets out for Harwich—Suddenly returns—Illness of the Queen—Confidential Communication of Sir Robert to her Majesty—Alarm lest the King should have overheard it . 404

CHAPTER XVIII.

Lady Suffolk—Rupture with the King—Goes to Bath—Resolves to retire—Sentiments of the Royal Family, Walpole, and the Public on this change—Dodington discarded by the Prince—Favour of Lyttelton—Princess of Orange puts to sea from Harwich, but returns—Proceeds at last by Calais—Foreign Affairs—Marriage of Don Carlos—Church Promotions—Hoadley reluctantly advanced to Winchester—Struggle for and against Rundle—Benson and Secker appointed to Gloucester and Bristol, and Rundle to Derry 423

CHAPTER XIX.

Household Offices—Duke of Richmond Master of the Horse; Lord Pembroke Groom of the Stole; Lord Godolphin's Pension and Peerage—Characters of these two Lords—Ideal Marriage of the Prince of Wales—Parliament meets—30,000 Seamen voted—Reasons for and against—Sir Joseph Jekyll—Marlborough Election—Miss Skerrett—Election Petition of the Scotch Peers—Debate in the Lords on the Troops—Walpole resists the disposition of the King and Queen to War—Public Expenses—Finance—Sinking Fund—Ministerial Changes—Messrs. Winnington and Fox recommended by Lord Hervey—King's Journey to Hanover opposed by Walpole in vain—Madame de Walmoden—Strange confidences to the Queen 456

APPENDIX 505

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

VOLUME I.

Page 25, note 17—Sir W. Wyndham was born in 1686.

Page 51, note 20—*After* hardly credible *add*—if it had not received confirmation from the Queen herself, *post*, ii. 478.

Page 56, note 25—*add*—see *post*, i. 430, and Chesterfield's '*Character*' of Lady Suffolk.

Page 96, note 8—He himself in his 'Letters' (24th May, 1750) lets us know that his height was *under* 5 feet 8, but does not specify how much—perhaps an inch or two. He mentions also (15th February, 1754) the early discolour of his teeth.

Page 129, note 11—*for* increased *read*—offered to increase.

Page 131—*for* 1703 *read*—1730.

Page 206, note 1—*for* Lincoln *read*—Clinton.

Page 228, note 14—*for* a great genius *read*—no great genius.

Page 273, note 2—*for* p. 319 *read*—p. 321.

Page 298, note—*for* 1750 *read*—1751.

Page 325, note 19—*add*—but the character of Addison, to which this line belongs, had been printed earlier.

Page 337, note—*for* 245 *read*—210.

Page 347—*for* assidiis *read*—assiduis.

Page 389, note 5—*add after* Wassenaar—He was afterwards Austrian Minister at our court.

Page 443, line 23—*for* Mr. C. C^{n}. *read*—Mrs. Clayton.

Page 473, note 4—I find the two sitting Members were in opposition both to the Court and Lord Hertford, but I still cannot account for the other discrepancies.

PREFATORY AND BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE.

THE existence of Lord Hervey's '*Memoirs from his first coming to Court to the Death of the Queen*'[1] was announced to the world in 1757 in Walpole's '*Catalogue of Royal and Noble Authors*,' and in 1788 we find Lord Hailes, in a note to his compilation of the *Opinions of the Duchess of Marlborough*, saying, with reference to the quarrel between George II. and Frederick Prince of Wales—

"I cannot discover what was the real cause of this unhappy quarrel. The Duchess seems to think that it originated in the motion for augmenting the Prince's revenue. *It is probable that the whole matter will be explained to posterity should the Memoirs of Lord Hervey ever see the light. I have reason to believe they are written with great freedom.* And here I must be permitted to observe, that they who suppress such memorials of modern times do all that in them lies to leave the history of the eighteenth century in darkness. In the sixteenth century it was the fashion to preserve original papers, during the eighteenth it is the fashion to destroy them. Hence we know more of the reign of Queen Elizabeth than we do of the reign of George I." —*Opinions.*

Mr. Bowles, in his Life of Pope (1806), says:—

[1] Lord Hervey's own title is given at the head of the Memoirs.

"Lord Hervey wrote *Memoirs of his Own Time*, with strict injunctions that they were not to be published until the decease of his present Majesty (George III.). They are now in the possession of Lord Hervey's son, General Hervey, and will be published as soon as the event mentioned takes place."

This injunction was not given by Lord Hervey, but in the will of his son Augustus, third Earl of Bristol; and Lord Hailes himself, if he had seen the MS., would, no doubt, have been, as every reader will now be, of opinion that the reserve of the possessors of the Memoirs was dictated by unquestionable feelings of delicacy and duty. The prescribed period, however, has been now exceeded by a quarter of a century, and it is hoped that after the lapse of 110 years since it was written, this contribution to the history of the eighteenth century, so desiderated by Lord Hailes and in itself so curious, may be at last, without impropriety, given to the public.

The MS., which is wholly autograph, is remarkably clear and legible, and it is now presented to the reader *in extenso*, with the following exceptions.

There are some chasms in the MS., occasioned by former possessors having destroyed several sheets here and there, that appear to have contained additional details of the dissensions in the Royal Family; of which, however, so much still remains that we need hardly, I think, regret the want of more. These omissions have spared us, no doubt, some scandal; but they have not, it is believed, essentially diminished the historical value of Lord Hervey's work. On this, however, the reader will be in some degree enabled to form his own conjectures; for the places and extent

of the omissions are almost everywhere noted,[2] and the context will generally indicate the character of what is lost.

My own deviations from the MS. have been the correction of the somewhat lax and antiquated orthography—the suppression here and there of an indelicate expression, and the substitution of a more decent equivalent. It must be recollected that the style of the day, both in conversation and correspondence, was often very coarse—the best bred men and the most elegant women talked and wrote in a style that has been long banished from good society. They were in the habit, as Swift said and practised, of "calling a spade a spade;" and without asserting dogmatically (what, nevertheless, there seems good reason to hope) that both the morals and manners of modern society are essentially improved, we may at least venture to say that they are more decorous. Lord Holland, in editing Walpole's first Memoirs, and every one, I suppose, who has had to perform that office for any familiar letters of the earlier part of the last century, has been obliged to retrench or correct many verbal breaches of decorum. The total suppression of such passages would be an obvious remedy, and the most satisfactory, but for one consideration—the very indelicacies are important items towards the history of general manners and the estimate of individual

[2] I find, on comparing the *copy* supplied to me with the original manuscript, that four or five of these omissions were not noticed. One of the longest of these occurred at p. 315 of vol. i., after the mention of the Prince and Lord Hervey; but they all evidently are of the character mentioned in the text.

character, and to omit them altogether, or to smooth down such irregularities to our more decent level, would really be a deception. They should be suppressed, but not concealed. Whenever, therefore, any such instances occur (and they are not very numerous), I have noted, as Lord Holland did, the place of the omission, and have distinguished any substituted words by brackets, thus [ ]. On this point the most serious criticism that I expect to hear is that I have not gone far enough; and though I hope I have removed every expression positively offensive to a delicate mind, I acknowledge that there is a great deal—particularly as to the feelings and temper of the Royal Family—which I wish I could have felt myself authorised to suppress: that, however, would have been an unpardonable distortion —indeed, a falsification—of my materials; and after all a useless one—for Walpole's *Reminiscences* and *Memoirs* and the recently published extracts from the *Diaries* of Lord-Chancellors King and Hardwicke reveal, though not in such detail as Lord Hervey gives, the substantial facts that I should have been most anxious to suppress.

I have therefore, on the whole, thought it my duty to exhibit the Memoirs as Lord Hervey himself had left them for publication, with the exceptions I have just stated; though few readers, I believe, would regret if some other episodes of a very different character had been omitted—I mean sundry digressions on foreign affairs, which, however interesting in the court of George II., are now wholly obsolete, and contain nothing that is not already to be found in all the ordinary histories.

After these introductory observations, I proceed to give the reader the best account I can of the extraordinary author of this extraordinary work.

A knowledge of the personal partialities of an historian, even when he deals with remote periods and persons, sometimes helps to elucidate his works. But with those who write the history of their own times and of affairs to which they have been active and interested parties, we can hardly have too intimate an acquaintance, and every detail of their lives becomes important to the value of their evidence. For this reason I have endeavoured (at the risk of being in other respects tedious) to collect as much as I could of the private life and character of Lord Hervey as a useful, and indeed essential, preliminary to his Memoirs.

He was the eldest son of John, first Earl of Bristol, by his second wife Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Thomas Felton and Lady Elizabeth Howard, daughter and heiress of the third Earl of Suffolk.

An elder son, by a former marriage, Carr, Lord Hervey—"was reckoned," said Horace Walpole, "to have had parts superior to those of his more celebrated brother;" and Pope, in one of his sarcastic appeals to the second Lord Hervey, professes his pleasure at paying to the memory of the first "the debt I owed to his friendship, whose early death deprived your family of as much *wit* and *honour* as he left behind him in any branch of it." But these good qualities were obscured by great irregularities of conduct, and extinguished by an early death.

Carr, Lord Hervey, is said, in Lady Louisa Stuart's introductory observations to Lord Wharncliffe's edition of the Works of her grandmother, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, to have been notoriously the father of Horace Walpole—an opinion strongly supported by various circumstances mentioned by Lady Louisa, and further corroborated by the revelations, in the following Memoirs, of Sir Robert Walpole's almost incredible laxity in both the principle and practice of conjugal fidelity. The resemblance, indeed, of Horace to that remarkable family, whose peculiar originality of mind and character gave rise to Lady Mary's division of the human species into "*Men, Women, and Herveys,*" is very striking, and these Memoirs will, I think, add considerably to the general likeness.

The father of the young Lords, John Hervey, Esquire, of Ickworth, near Bury in Suffolk, a country gentleman of ancient family and ample fortune, represented that borough—as he and his ancestors had done for a long series of parliaments—till March, 1703, when, through the friendship of the Duke of Marlborough and the influence of the Duchess,[3] he was created Lord Hervey, a title which had already existed and become extinct in a junior branch of his family;[4]

---

[3] The Duchess distinctly states in her '*Account of her Conduct*,' that *she* did it altogether at the request of Sir Thomas Felton, Mrs. Hervey's father—to whom she had promised it. Lord Bristol, however, acknowledges his obligation to the *Duke*, and even says in one of his letters to his Grace, 9th July, 1704, that he had on his peerage retained the motto of "*Je n'oublieray jamais*" with special reference to his gratitude to his Grace.

[4] William Hervey, second son of John Hervey of Ickworth, was an eminent naval and military officer. He distinguished himself in the defeat of the Armada; was knighted in 1596; created a baronet in 1619; next year,

and at the accession of George I. he was created Earl of Bristol; his wife was appointed a Lady of the Princess's Bedchamber, and his eldest son a Lord of the Prince's.

Lord Bristol appears, from a large collection of his correspondence which has been carefully preserved, to have been one of the best of men, though not without some share of that peculiar character just alluded to. He, however, seems to have had the better parts only of this piquant originality. He was highly accomplished—an elegant scholar, and what might even be called learned, for his reading was extensive and uncommon. He was familiar with the best classical and modern poets, and wrote[5] verses himself. Though evidently a fine gentleman in taste and manners, he was, in the habits and occupations of, at least, the latter half of his life, a good deal of the country squire. In his family he seems to have been the fondest, most indulgent, and most patient of husbands and fathers under many hard trials of his temper in both those capacities, and, to complete this amiable character, he was, from first to last, a very peculiar example of Christian piety.

Lord Ross, in Ireland; and in 1627, Lord Hervey, in England. He died in 1642, and was buried, with great pomp, in Westminster Abbey. He left an only daughter, who married her cousin, John Hervey, uncle of the first Lord Bristol, whose father Sir Thomas—his brother leaving no issue—succeeded to Ickworth.

[5] I find in his letter-book several of his copies of verses: they are in the affected style of Cowley, to which his family friendship for that poet might have naturally led him. His grandfather had been a patron of Cowley, whose elegy on his great uncle, *William Hervey*, is one of the best of his works; and though neither it nor *Lycidas* (which it much resembles) can be altogether defended from some of the matter-of-fact criticisms of Johnson, I wonder that any one having eye, ear, or heart, could be insensible to the imagery, music, and tenderness of both.

In all the events of his life, painful or fortunate, the first and sometimes very enthusiastic effusions of his grief or his gratitude were towards Heaven. Of his father, Sir Thomas Hervey, he writes to the tutor of one of his sons:—"*His piety, chastity, charity, truth, and justice, mixed with wonderful wit and innocent mirth, made singularly his own that comprehensive character—Ita in singulis virtutibus eminebat quasi cæteras non haberet.*" His own son has said as much of him.

In politics Lord Bristol was a Whig of the old school; and of course—while professing "*to hold an equal balance between the prerogatives of the Crown and the privileges of the people, and maintain the monarchy and hierarchy in their just and legal rights*"—he was a warm supporter of Revolution principles and of the Hanover succession, and his promotion to the Earldom (19th October, 1714) was one of the earliest acts of the new reign; but after that event—whether resenting the neglect shown to the Duke of Marlborough, or thinking that the Whigs were deviating from their earlier principles, particularly in the maintenance of a standing army, or from any more personal motive[6]—he appears

---

[6] I know not whether he would have accepted *office*, but I think he would have been pleased to have had the offer. He gives early hints of dissatisfaction with the Minister; and in one letter, of December, 1716, to his son John, then at Hanover, he warns him, that if he should come home in the King's train, he may chance, being an unofficial follower, to have sorry accommodation, "*should those who attend the King there take no more care in providing for the son, than others whom his Majesty has thought fit to entrust here ever did for the father. However, be to them, I conjure you, like your constant father—*

'*True as the dial to the sun,*
Although you are not shined upon.'"

This seems rather unreasonable from one who had been so lately raised

to have taken little part in public affairs, and to have adopted in private a strong tone of opposition to Sir Robert Walpole and his administration.

This portrait, sketched from a large mass of private letters which evolve all the thoughts and transactions of his life, very closely resembles that given of him by *his* son towards the close of the Memoirs (*post*, ii. 437), and I introduce it the rather because it seems probable that Lord Hervey derived from this almost forgotten but remarkable man all the better as well as some of the more brilliant peculiarities of his character.

Differing in political opinion, in the habits of their lives, and, unfortunately for the son, still more in moral conduct and religious impressions, there seems to have been a strong resemblance in their styles, tastes, manners, and turns of thought; and it is not the least peculiar circumstance of their history that, notwithstanding this opposition of principles and similarity of tempers, they lived together in the most unbounded and uninterrupted confidence and affection.

John Hervey was educated at Westminster School under Dr. Friend, whence he was removed, the 20th

---

to the peerage, and advanced to an Earldom within two years—"the only favour,"—writes Lord Hervey in an epitaph *prepared* for his father—

> "The only favour that the Crown could give,
> He thought worth asking, or would e'er receive;
> The name of *servant* was too near to *slave*."
>
> *Gage's Suffolk.*

Yet he did not disdain that name for his lady and *four*, at least, of his sons, who had Court places, while the Earl fancied himself and his family neglected. But this grumbling on paper, whilst he was in his daily devotions thanking Heaven for his worldly prosperity and success, was one of the peculiarities of the good man.

November, 1713, to Clare Hall, Cambridge, where he graduated M.A. as a nobleman in 1715. In his vacations he often attended his father (at that time a distinguished patron of the turf) to Newmarket, and showed a turn and talent for jockeyship, which his father's sagacity was willing to encourage as tending to manly tastes and habits. On one occasion he was to have ridden a celebrated match, but the fond terrors of his mother overruled his own and his father's wishes: it was, however, some consolation to both, that the substituted jockey won the race by following the judicious advice of the younger, in preference to the orders of his elder master.

In the summer of 1716 he visited Paris, and after spending some months there was directed by his father to proceed through Austrian Flanders to *pay his court* at Hanover, where George I. then was. His brother, Carr, had been sent on a like politic errand in Queen Anne's time, and had ingratiated himself with the Elector, and more particularly with his son Prince George, and on the accession had been appointed one of his Royal Highness's Lords of the Bedchamber. The old Lord anticipated a similar good result from this visit, and was much pleased to find that "dear Jack" had laid a sure foundation in the favour of his Majesty's grandson, Prince Frederick—of "the blooming beauties of whose person and character" the young traveller had given his father a lively description.

It had been intended that he should proceed through Germany to Italy, but "the fears and tears" of his mother forced his reluctant father to give up that project and recall him to England. At this time "his genius

tended to some military employ," and his mother—whose apprehensions, it seems, were for his health and morals rather than of personal risk—suggests his preferring a petition, in her name and with his own graces, to a certain great lady (the Duchess of Kendal probably) to obtain for him a commission in the Guards.[7]

How Hervey occupied his time after his return to England does not appear, but all idea of the army or any other profession seems to have been soon abandoned, and he spent much of his time with his father in the retirement of Ickworth, and the rest, probably, in the fashionable and literary circles of the metropolis. He even then cultivated his own poetical taste so assiduously as to induce his anxious father to urge him to prepare himself for public and especially parliamentary life, by more serious and useful studies than "the perpetual pursuit of poetry."

During the *waiting* of his mother and his brother he was a frequent visitor to the Court of the Prince and Princess at Richmond, where he soon became a great personal favourite; and here he made those acquaintances which biassed in various ways his future career. At this period Pope and his literary friends were in great favour at this young court, of which, in addition to the handsome and clever Princess herself, Mrs. Howard, Mrs. Selwyn, Miss Howe, Miss Bellenden, and Miss

---

7 In this request Lord Bristol, in spite of his aversion to a standing army, directly concurred, and did, in fact, procure commissions for two younger sons; though his prejudice became afterwards so strong that the only serious difference I have discovered between him and Lord Hervey was in consequence of the latter's putting *his* son George into the Guards.—See *post*, ii. 593.

Lepell, with Lords Chesterfield, Bathurst, Scarborough, and Hervey, were the chief ornaments. Above all for beauty and wit were Miss Bellenden and Miss Lepell,[8] who seem to have treated Pope, and been in return treated by him, with a familiarity that appears rather strange in our more decorous days. These young ladies probably considered him as no more than what Aaron Hill described him :—

> "Tuneful Alexis on the Thames' fair side,
> The ladies' *plaything* and the Muses' pride."

Very intimate and very familiar they certainly became with him, and with his friend Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, who at his suggestion had now taken a villa at Twickenham.

In this gay and giddy society John Hervey soon attached himself to Miss, or, as it was then the fashion to say, Mrs. Lepell—the daughter and heiress of Brigadier-General Nicholas Lepell. Of her person, mind, and manners there is from all her contemporaries a chorus of praise: even Pope, when he subsequently so unmercifully libelled Lord Hervey, made his satire the keener by praising his wife; and Lady Louisa Stuart, who happily preserves to our age the tradi-

---

[8] The books state that she was born 26th September, 1700; but Pope, in a letter that mentions the recent death of Dr. Radcliffe, who died 6th November, 1714, describes her and her friend Miss Bellenden as then maids of honour to the Princess. If all this be so, Miss Lepell was a maid of honour when she was barely fourteen. She was of the family to whom belonged the little Channel Island of Sark. I find in the Magazines for 1743 the death of '*Nicholas Lepell, Esq., Lord Proprietor of Sark.*' The natives of Sark are more than half French, and this probably gave the French tinge to Lady Hervey's tastes and manners—a subject of frequent pleasantry with her friends and herself.

tions of the last, says of her that it might be suspected that

"Lord Hervey's avowed enemies—Pope for one—went out of their way to compliment and eulogise her. However, their praises were not unmerited: by the attractions she retained in age she must have been singularly captivating when young, gay, and handsome; and never was there so perfect a model of the finely polished, highly bred, genuine woman of fashion. Her manners had a foreign tinge which some called affected, but they were gentle, easy, dignified, and altogether exquisitely pleasing."[9]—*Introductory Anecdotes, ubi supra.*

To her more solid merits as a daughter, a wife, and a mother we have the earlier, and nearer, and more valuable testimony of Lord Bristol, who seems to have been enchanted, not more by the brilliant than the amiable qualities of his daughter-in-law, and to have endeavoured, with a growing affection and admiration, to render less irksome to her the occasional vivacities of his Countess—a lady of considerable talents—a very lively but not equable temper, and of so ready and sharp a wit, that in one of her letters she triumphantly tells Lord Bristol that she had answered some impertinencies at Court so cleverly, that the

---

[9] See also a similar character of Lady Hervey in Chesterfield's *Letters to his Son*, 22nd Oct. 1750; and another, if possible more favourable, in H. Walpole's *Letter to Mann*, 22 Sept. 1768. He also wrote an epitaph on her tomb at Ickworth, with little poetry but with feeling and truth. Churchill thus celebrates her daughter Lady Caroline:—

"That face, that form, that dignity and ease—
Those powers of pleasing, and that wish to please—
By which Lepell, even in her youthful days,
Had from the currish Pope extracted praise,
We see, transmitted, in her daughter shine,
And view a new *Lepell* in Caroline."

Queen said, "she saw that Lord Hervey had derived his talent at repartee from his *mother*."

From her too, as well as from his father, he may have inherited some of his indefatigable turn for versification; for the gods had also made her—after a manner—poetical. There are, in a volume of family correspondence, several copies of love verses addressed to her husband both before and after marriage, and one more remarkable poem of about one hundred and fifty lines, with this title, '*An imperfect Sketch of the Earl of Bristol's Character; collected from several Authors by the Countess of Bristol.*' The lines are selected with judgment, and moulded together with considerable ingenuity and success; and at the end of this elaborate and affectionate *cento*, she adds, of her own composition,—

> "Could I like Cowley think or Dryden write,
> In Otway's tender words my soul indite,
> I then in *verse* might hope to soar above
> All other mortals—*as I do in love!*"

And this seems to have been no hyperbole: the whole correspondence between Lord and Lady Bristol during their occasional separations, from their marriage in 1695 to 1737, has been preserved, and it exhibits a series of *love letters*, by almost every post, of a passionate fondness that would seem excessive after a few months' matrimony. Lord Bristol was—in all tender emotions at least—something of an enthusiast, and the Countess was vehement in all her feelings.

There was some mystery about the marriage of Mr. Hervey and Miss Lepell: the publications of the day and all the peerages date it as of the 25th of

October, 1720, and there is no doubt that it was only then publicly declared; but there is extant a letter of Lord Bristol, dated the 20th of May preceding, congratulating the lady in the most affectionate terms on her marriage, which, however, he calls a "secret." In the summer of that year the young lady (still no doubt under her maiden name) paid a visit to Ickworth, and in two letters after this visit, but prior to the 25th of October, Lord Bristol again addresses her "*by the endearing title of daughter.*" I have not been able to discover in what month of 1720 *Gay's* curious and characteristic verses called '*Mr. Pope's Welcome from Greece*' (that is, on his having finished the translation of the Iliad) were published, but it must have been written during the courtship and before the declaration of the marriage; for among Pope's congratulating friends we find the lovers:—

> "Now Hervey, fair of face, I mark full well,
> With thee, youth's youngest daughter, sweet Lepell."

All the editors of Pope, misled by the terms *fair of face*, tell us that "*Hervey*" meant *Lady* Hervey; but they fail to tell us who then was "*sweet Lepell*;"[10] but, in fact, "*Hervey*" was *Lord* Hervey, whose countenance was remarkably, though rather effeminately handsome. So, in a ballad celebrated in its day, we read:—

---

[10] Mr. Roscoe, who adopts the first blunder, makes a second by supposing a younger Miss Lepell, who, I believe, never existed. I must observe that most of the personal notes in all editions of Pope, Swift, and Gay, are very unsatisfactory, but on this little poem, where they are so necessary, they are peculiarly meagre and remarkably erroneous.

"For Venus had never seen bedded
So perfect a beau and a belle,
As when *Hervey the handsome* was wedded
To the *beautiful Molly Lepell.*" [11]

What then delayed the announcement of their union? It is hard to guess, but there is a clue. It will be seen in Walpole's Reminiscences and in these Memoirs that the Prince had been smitten by Miss Lepell's lively and beautiful friend and colleague Mary Bellenden, who had rejected the royal but not very delicate advances. Walpole adds—

"In fact her heart was engaged, and so the Prince, finding his love fruitless, suspected. He was even so generous as to promise her that if she would discover the object of her choice and not marry without his privity, he would consent to the match and be kind to her husband. She gave him the promise without acknowledging the person, and then, lest his Highness should throw any obstacle in the way, she married without his knowledge Colonel Campbell (long afterwards Duke of Argyle), one of the grooms of his bedchamber."—*Reminiscences.*

Now it turns out that the announcements of the marriages of Miss Bellenden and Miss Lepell were made about the same time, the former dated the 22nd, the latter the 25th of October, and we know, from Walpole

---

[11] Arbuthnot, in a letter to Swift, 8th November, 1726, gives us the birth and parentage of this ballad. "I gave your service to Lady Hervey. She is in a little sort of a miff about a ballad that was writ on her to the tune of 'Molly Mogg,' and sent her in the name of a *begging poet.* She was *bit*, and wrote a letter to the begging poet, and desired him to change two *double entendres*; which the authors—*Mr. Pulteney and Lord Chesterfield*—changed into *single entendres.* I was against *that*, though I had a hand in the first. She is not displeased, I believe, with the ballad, but only with being *bit.*" But the work of these great wits is (to say nothing of its indelicacy) a very poor trifle—and has no other stanza worth quoting.

and the *Suffolk Papers*[12] as to Miss Bellenden, and from Lord Bristol as to Miss Lepell, that *both* were post-dated; and may we not fairly infer that they influenced each other?—that all parties might be fearful of having offended by making a choice without the consent of their royal patrons, and that they for mutual support agreed to brave the storm together, and announced their marriages and consequent resignations just previous to the courtly *epoch* of the birthday, *the 30th of October*, when we find that two other young ladies were appointed in their room?

Lady Louisa Stuart's *Anecdotes* represent the young couple as from the outset leading a very fashionable life, rather after the French than the English fashion; but one or two random touches of her grandmother's satirical pen cannot detract from a character so universally respected as Lady Hervey's, and in fact these very passages, if closely looked at, contradict the imputation they seem to raise. But, on the other hand, it is too clear that the gentleman's conjugal principles and practice were very loose, and that his lady, if she had not had an innate sense of propriety, might have pleaded the example and the provocation of her husband's infidelity.

And here it may be as well to state that Lord Hervey's laxity of morals was accompanied, if not originally produced, by *scepticism* in religion. How a son so dutiful and affectionate, and resembling a

[12] Vol. i. p. 68. It should perhaps be added, that the eldest child of Lady Hervey was born on the 31st August, 1721, and that of Mrs. Campbell (Caroline, afterwards wife of Marshal Conway, and mother of Mrs. Damer) not before October, 1721. See *Suffolk Papers*, i. 82.

singularly pious father in so many other points, was led into such opposite courses, we have no distinct trace; but about the time that he exchanged the paternal converse of Ickworth for the society of London and the free-thinking Court of the Princess, Tindal, Toland, Collins, and Woolston were in high vogue, and it is too certain that Lord Hervey adopted all their anti-Christian opinions, and, by a natural consequence, a peculiar antipathy to the Church and Churchmen. This feeling, which breaks out in most of his writings, is visible in the Memoirs on every occasion where it could introduce itself; and in at least one separate publication he expressly promulgated it. It is stated in Walpole's Catalogue and conjecturally in the Biographies that a deistical defence (1732) of Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees* in answer to Berkeley's *Minute Philosopher*, though professing to be the work of "*a Country Clergyman*," was by Lord Hervey. I am sorry to be obliged to confirm the fact; and of the pamphlet itself I need only add that there is no more of taste, truth, or candour in the conduct of the argument than there was in the composition of the title-page.

On the 15th of November, 1723, by the death of his elder brother Carr, he succeeded to the title of Lord Hervey, and in March, 1725, was elected Member for Bury. I find no mention of him in Parliament, or in politics, or even in society till January, 1728, when, on the meeting of George II.'s first Parliament, he moved the Address in the House of Commons. But it appears from his confidential letter to Sir R. Walpole (*post*, i. 42) that he had previously attracted the Minister's notice and favour; and both he and Lord Bristol were

certainly disappointed at his not having been included in the *official* arrangements of the new reign.

And here, though it in some degree anticipates the course of events, I must observe—with reference to the tone and feeling of his Memoirs from the first page to the last, and indeed to the colour and character of his whole life—that it seems to have been a long, rankling, and by no means unreasonable mortification to a young nobleman of lively talents, strong ambition, unusual diligence, and a decided turn for politics and business, that—neither at the outset, nor during twelve or fourteen years of an assiduous, able, and even brilliant advocacy of the Ministry in both Houses of Parliament—should he have been thought deserving of any efficient office, or (as he himself, at the Queen's death, sharply complained) of any higher duty than the almost menial services of a Vice-Chamberlain. Paradoxical as it may sound, it was, I believe, his high favour with both the Queen and the Minister that occasioned this, we may rather call it injustice than neglect: the truth seems to be that he had obtained so much familiarity and favour with her Majesty, and was so essentially useful to Walpole in that all-important quarter, that though Sir Robert, in 1733, gratified his friend and strengthened the Administration by calling him up to the House of Lords and assigning him a confidential share in its debates, he was unwilling or afraid to lose his more delicate services at the ear of the Queen. Lord Hervey had talents which might probably have been more advantageously developed on a graver scene; but, however that may be, there is reason to suppose that his own dissatisfaction, and we know

that of Lord Bristol, went on increasing, till on the Queen's death the obstacle (according to my hypothesis) was removed, and Lord Hervey was, probably as soon as Walpole could make the arrangement, appointed to a high cabinet office—too late, however, to add much to the strength of his tottering party, or to his own reputation as a practical statesman. But we must return to an earlier period.

Lord Hervey, who seems to have had delicate health even in his youth, became as he grew up a valetudinarian. This, though probably constitutional, Lord Bristol ascribes to the use of "that *detestable and poisonous plant*—tea, which had once brought him *to* death's door, and if persisted in would carry him *through* it;" and he implores him in the most pathetic terms to give it up. Lord Hervey, however, had more faith in a change of climate—which, besides its influence on his bodily ailments, would remove him for a season from the House of Commons, the scene of his recent political disappointment—and very shortly after he had moved the Address, he set out for Italy, accompanied by Mr. Stephen Fox, whose chief inducement to the journey was—we are told in a poetical epistle addressed to him by Lord Hervey at Florence—to attend the invalid.[13] In this piece, after expatiating on the gratitude which he owes to his friend, and describing some of the scenes they had visited, he at last turns his thoughts homewards.

[13] It at first sight seems that he might have been more suitably accompanied by Lady Hervey, but we must recollect that she had already four young children to look after. We find in one of Lord Bristol's letters to Lord Hervey, while abroad, affectionate mention of "the number and length of his letters to Lady Hervey," but none of them have been found.

"O! would kind Heaven, these tedious sufferings past,
Permit me Ickworth, rest, and health at last,
In that lov'd shade, my youth's delightful seat,
My early pleasure and my late retreat.
* * * * *
There might I trifle carelessly away
The milder evening of life's clouded day;
From business and the world's intrusion free,
With books, with love, with beauty, and with thee.
* * * * *
But if the Gods, sinister still, deny
To live in Ickworth, let me there but die;
Thy hands to close my eyes in death's long night,
Thy image to attract their latest sight;
Then to the grave attend thy poet's hearse,
And love his memory as you loved his verse."

To this sentimental effusion—more like the address of a lover of *twenty* to his mistress, than of a man of *thirty-three* to his friend—Lady Mary Wortley, when it reached her, subjoined this commentary:—

"So sung the poet in a humble strain,
With empty pockets and a head in pain,
When the soft clime inclined the soul to rest,
And pastoral images inspired the breast;
Apollo listened from his heavenly bower,
And, in his health restored, expressed his power.
* * * * *
Returning vigour glowed in every vein,
And gay ideas fluttered through the brain;
Back he returns to breathe his native air,
And all his late resolves are melted there."[14]

[14] Both poems may be seen at length in Lady Mary's Works, iii. 376. Lord Hervey's Epistle is in Dodsley's Collection, iii. 181, and is followed by another, also addressed to Mr. Fox, dated 1731, less commendable for either morals or poetry. The four best lines in it are marked by Lord Hervey's turn for antithesis—

"For life has joys adapted to each stage;
Love for our youth, ambition for our age;
But wilful man, inverting her decrees,
When young would govern, and when old would please."

The versification of all these poems seems to me very much superior to the rugged specimens we shall see in the Memoirs.

Lady Mary was right. He came home, and never again willingly visited Ickworth; nor was it till his dismissal from office that he began to imagine the possibility of enduring that banishment; which, on the contrary, the old Earl seldom mentions without some affectionate epithet, as "*dear* Ickworth"—"*sweet* Ickworth."

I cannot exactly ascertain the dates of the *Four Epistles after the manner of Ovid* (nor, indeed, of some other pieces), which appear as Lord Hervey's in the 4th vol. of Dodsley's 'Collection,' on which so much of his poetical reputation was founded.[15] That which Walpole prefers, '*Monimia to Philocles*,' was written, I suppose, before he went abroad. It was designed, Walpole says, for the giddy and unfortunate Sophia Howe, Maid of Honour to the Princess (who died in 1726) and Mr. Anthony Lowther; and seems to have more of reality and truth mingled with its tenderness than the general run of those pedantic imitations which Pope's '*Sappho to Phaon*,' and still more, his '*Eloisa*' had brought into fashion. Hervey's other epistles are much inferior. But there is another piece in the same volume, purporting to be an '*Answer*,' by Lord Hervey, in the character of Miss Dashwood,[16] to the least frigid

[15] Besides the pieces of Lord Hervey's mentioned by Walpole and Park (*Noble Authors*), the following are to be found in the 'New Foundling Hospital for Wit,' i. 239, et seq. '*Verses to Mr. Poyntz, with Secker's Sermon on Education*,' the '*Epigram on Chiswick*' (*post*, vol. ii. p. 145), and a longer satire on the same villa.

[16] Amidst this gossip of the last century, I shall, perhaps, be forgiven for recording that my old acquaintance, Lady Corke, who died in 1840, at the age of ninety-four, told me that she had known *Kitty Dashwood* very well, and that Hammond undoubtedly died for love; "the only instance of the kind," she said, "that she had ever known in her long life." Kitty

of Hammond's Elegiacal addresses to his *Delia*, which is in a better style, both of poetry and good sense, and which even now may be read with pleasure. There seems, however, some mystery as to the authorship of this poem. It is stated expressly in Dodsley (p. 79) to be "*by the late Lord Hervey;*" but I have before me a volume from the library at Ickworth, in which Lord Hervey had collected several poems attributed to himself and Lady Mary Wortley, and in this volume I find, under the date of 1743, what seems the first edition of this '*Answer*,' purporting on the original title-page to be "*by a* LADY, *author of the Verses to the Imitator of Horace.*" Was this a false title-page, or was Lady Mary the author? or was it a conjoint production? I postpone the discussion of these questions till we arrive at the '*Verses to the Imitator of Horace*,' about which the same kind of difficulty hangs.

Before Lord Hervey's return from Italy, George II. had been most reluctantly driven into bringing Prince Frederick, now just of age, to England, and creating him Prince of Wales; and I need make no apology for giving the earliest portrait I have found of a person who occupies so large a share in Lord Hervey's personal history as well as in his Memoirs. Lady Bristol writes on the 7th of January, 1729, to her Lord whom she had just left:—

"My three days' journey [from Ickworth to town] was supported by as many doses of laudanum, the strength of which

---

had at first accepted, but afterwards rejected him, on—Lady Corke, and indeed all *Kitty's* contemporaries, thought—*prudential* reasons; and this is the tone of Lord Hervey's answer. Hammond died in 1742, and Miss Dashwood in 1779, bedchamber-woman to Queen Charlotte.

enabled me to go to Court yesterday, where *I* was most graciously received and *you* kindly inquired after. I introduced Lady Hervey to the Prince of Wales—the most agreeable young man it is possible to imagine, without being the least handsome; his person little, but very well made, and genteel; a liveliness in his eyes that is indescribable, and the most obliging address that can be conceived; but the crown of all his perfection is, that great duty and regard he pays the King and Queen, with such a mixture of affection, as if obliging them were the greatest pleasure of his life, and they receive it with the utmost joy and satisfaction, and the father's fondness seems to equal the tenderness of the mother; so that, I believe, the world never produced a royal family so happy in one another. *Pray God long to continue it.*"

It did not long continue; and the tardy coming of the Prince, as well as some other circumstances (*post*, ii. 412), give us reason to suspect that, even at the outset, all was not as cordial as it appeared.

Lord Hervey returned from Italy about the middle of September, 1729, and he appears to have soon improved the impression he had made on the Prince at Hanover into great intimacy and favour. There is an expression in the Memoirs referring to the time when Lord Hervey "*first came about him*" (vol. ii. p. 384), which seems to imply that he had belonged officially to the Prince's family, but there is no other trace of any such employment, and his having a pension of 1000*l.* a-year from the King, who was a strict economist in such matters, seems inconsistent with his holding also a place. The studied silence in which Lord Hervey buries his earlier intercourse and subsequent quarrel with the Prince (*post*, i. 159, n.), leaves the details of their friendship and their enmity in much obscurity: certain it is that a short but close intimacy was followed

by a deep and lasting hatred; of which a rivalry for, and, what is worse, a community in, the favour of the unfortunate Miss Vane, had no doubt a large share:[17] but there can be little doubt that there were also some political *tracasseries* between them. However this may be, it is certain that the dark picture the Memoirs give us of the Prince must be received with a large allowance for the prejudice of the painter.

We now come to the busy part of his life where the Memoirs begin, but they are written, as the reader will see, with much reserve as to his personal history; all that they in their present state tell us of this period is, that he broke away from Pulteney, enlisted heartily under Walpole, and was soon after rewarded with the office of Vice-Chamberlain. This summary requires both retrospective and prospective explanation.

At his marriage Lord Hervey's personal and political interests and feelings were in unison; his mother, his brother, and his wife held offices in the Prince's Court, which was in declared Opposition; Lord Bristol, too, was dissatisfied with the Ministry. Pulteney was the intimate friend both of Hervey and his wife, and shortly before the time of his breaking with Walpole and taking the lead of the Opposition, he stood sponsor to Hervey's eldest daughter. Lords Chesterfield, Bolingbroke, and Bathurst, Pope, Gay, Arbuthnot, and latterly Swift, with the ladies of the Prince's Court, completed a circle at Richmond and Twickenham, very factious, no doubt, against Walpole, but very agreeable in itself. On the death, however, of

---

[17] See *post*, i. 329; ii. 20, 385.

George I., when the ascendancy of the Queen had confirmed Sir Robert in power, the scene changed, and Lord Hervey, already, it is evident, a favourite with her Majesty, naturally followed her, as did most of her Court, into the Ministerial camp, and was gratified, but certainly not satisfied, with a pension given him, no doubt instead of a place. On his return from abroad, however, he was, we shall see, undecided what course to take, and Walpole and Pulteney seem to have both *bidden* for him: a chasm in the Memoirs (almost the only one that I regret) has deprived us of the details of this struggle; but Walpole carried off the prize, and on the 7th of May, 1730, Lord Hervey received the gold key of Vice-Chamberlain to the King—*Inde iræ!*

The celebrated party-paper the '*Craftsman*' had been set up in the last year of the late reign to oppose Walpole, and it now became the vehicle of all the exasperated animosity of Pulteney and Bolingbroke. Against this formidable antagonist of the Ministry to which he now belonged, Lord Hervey drew a sharp and ready pen in numerous pamphlets, which Horace Walpole—probably with some partiality to the partisan of Sir Robert—thought "*equal to any that ever were written.*" Some of them have certainly considerable literary merit, though their subjects are now obsolete; and one of them—one at least imputed to him—had consequences very important to his private as well as his political character. In the first days of 1731 appeared a pamphlet in answer to the 'Craftsman,' under the title of '*Sedition and Defamation displayed,*' to which was prefixed a clever and caustic '*Dedication to the Patrons of the Craftsman,*' that is, Pulteney and

Bolingbroke. This, Pulteney attributed to Hervey, and in a few days published, under the signature of the Craftsman, '*A proper Reply to a late scurrilous Libel.*' This Reply was no doubt thought very pungent in its day, but it now seems coarse, weak, and even dull; very much beneath the dignity of a person in Pulteney's position, and very inferior to a brilliant pamphlet which he soon after published against Walpole himself. This latter pamphlet revealed some coarse expressions which Walpole in their former intimacy had used to him against the King when Prince, which so exasperated his Majesty—not against Walpole, as Pulteney no doubt expected, but—against himself, that the King struck his name out of the Privy Council.

Pulteney's '*Reply*' affects to treat Hervey as a thing below contempt—makes his personal appearance an excuse for calling him a *half-man half-woman* in the most indecent terms, and, in short, affords the original hints for all the insinuations and insults which Pope afterwards introduced into the famous character of *Sporus*. A duel ensued, and certainly, considering the peculiar nature of the offence, one can hardly imagine a more justifiable occasion for such an appeal. Of this event we have the following account in a letter from Mr. Thomas Pelham to Lord Waldegrave, then Ambassador at Paris:—

"London, 28th Jan., 1731.

"Lord Hervey sent a message to Mr. Pulteney, desiring to know whether he wrote the late pamphlet called '*The Reply*' to that of '*Sedition and Defamation displayed;*' in answer to which Pulteney said he would not satisfy Lord Hervey till he knew whether his Lordship was the author of the '*Dedication*' to the

latter. Accordingly, Lord Hervey sent him word that he was not: and Mr. Fox, who carried this message, asked Mr. Pulteney what answer he would give about '*The Reply*?' to which Mr. Pulteney said, that since Lord Hervey did not write the '*Dedication*' he was satisfied. But Fox insisting upon some other answer with relation to '*The Reply*,' Pulteney then said that he might tell Lord Hervey that whether he (Pulteney) was the author of '*The Reply*' or not, he was ready to justify and stand by the truth of any part of it at what time and wherever Lord Hervey pleased. This last message your Lordship will easily imagine was the occasion of the duel; and, accordingly, on Monday last the 25th, at between three and four o'clock, they met in the Upper St. James's Park,[18] behind Arlington Street, with their two seconds, who were Mr. Fox and Sir J. Rushout. The two combatants were each of them slightly wounded, but Mr. Pulteney had once so much the advantage of Lord Hervey, that he would have infallibly run my Lord through the body if his foot had not slipped, and then the seconds took an occasion to part them. Upon which Mr. Pulteney embraced Lord Hervey, and expressed a great deal of concern at the accident of their quarrel, promising at the same time that he would never personally attack him again, either with his mouth or his pen. Lord Hervey made him a bow, without giving him any sort of answer, and (to use the common expression) thus they parted."—*Coxe, App.*

Mr. Pelham, who in this narration professes only to "*give the talk of the town, as well as he has been able to collect it*," records what I suppose must be a mistake in making Lord Hervey deny the authorship of the *Dedication*, which it seems certain that he wrote. What Lord Hervey might have denied was the *Pamphlet*, which was, in fact, not his, but probably Sir William Yonge's; and this confusion between the *Pamphlet* and the *Dedication* (which Pulteney himself suspected to have been by dif-

[18] Now the Green Park.

ferent hands) has hitherto obscured this story, and made it appear as if this celebrated duel had been fought under an entire mistake. Coxe says, and has been copied by subsequent writers, that "it afterwards appeared that Lord Hervey did not compose this pamphlet, which was really written by Sir W. Yonge, as he himself confessed to Lord Hardwicke; and Pulteney acknowledged his mistake, and imputed it, without sufficient authority, to Walpole himself."—(*Coxe*, i. 362.) This is not inconsistent with Lord Hervey's having written the *Dedication*; but Pulteney himself, in his second pamphlet (before mentioned), charges Walpole with being the *sole* author of *Defamation Displayed*, and with having endeavoured to pass it off as "*a Noble Lord's*," which, he says, led to the duel; and he reproaches Walpole with the mischief that might have ensued from that *mistake*—making no distinction (as he had done in the '*Reply*') between the Dedication and the Pamphlet, and acquitting Lord Hervey of the whole. This would seem conclusive, even against the strong internal evidence of the Dedication; but a marginal note in the copy of the pamphlet at Ickworth, apparently in Lord Hervey's own hand, states that the Dedication was by him. Now if this was, as I believe, the fact, it seems that Lord Hervey was the aggressor; and Pulteney, in the '*Reply*,' states, moreover, that this was not Hervey's first offence. It is indeed true that his attack was merely political, with as little personality as might be, and that Pulteney's retort had too large an intermixture of ribaldry and venom; but in measuring the blame of such scuffles the question with the world will always be—as Lord Hervey himself afterwards urged

in his quarrel with Pope—who struck the first blow? and, as far as we can now see, it was Lord Hervey.

But such was not the case in his quarrel with Pope. Pope had long professed the utmost admiration and affection for Lady Mary Wortley. Some of his sweetest verses are in her praise, as the most disgusting he ever wrote were afterwards pointed at her. Lady Mary had always been the intimate friend of Lady Bristol,[19] and she was, both hereditarily as it were, and by taste, from youth to age the friend of Lord Hervey. We know nothing of the precise state or cause of the rupture between Pope and Lady Mary, in which Lord Hervey became implicated. It has been ascribed to the "*rivalry*" of the gentlemen "*for the good graces of the Lady;*" but I can trace no evidence for this statement, and there is some against it. Spence gives us Lady Mary's own account of the quarrel thus:—

"I have got fifty or sixty of Mr. Pope's letters by me. You shall see what a goddess he makes of me in them, though he makes such a devil of me in his writings afterwards, *without any reason that I know of.* I got a third person to ask him why he had left off visiting me: he answered, negligently, that he went as often as he used to do. I then got Dr. Arbuthnot to ask him what Lady Mary had done to him? He said that Lady Mary and Lord H. [Hervey] had pressed him once together—(*and I do not remember that we ever were together with him in our lives*)—to write a satire on certain persons; that he refused it, and that this had occasioned the breach between us." —*Spence's Anecdotes*, 31.

It would be now idle to seek for a cause of quarrel

[19] To Lady Bristol were addressed some of her most celebrated letters from the East.

which the parties were, an hundred years ago, unable or unwilling to explain; but may it not be sufficiently accounted for by the jealousies almost inevitable between persons of such similar and therefore discordant tastes and tempers, living together in a circle of tittle-tattle, scandal, and pasquinades? "It must be owned," says Lord Chesterfield (*Characters*), "that Pope was the most irritable of all the *genus irritabile vatum*, offended with trifles, and never forgetting or forgiving them." Pope himself admits that he discontinued his acquaintance with his noble friends "*merely because they both had too much wit for him.*" He dates his estrangement from Lord Hervey so early as 1725; and we may easily conceive how much these personal differences must have been sharpened by political animosity, when, in 1727, the new Court discarded its old Opposition connexions and adopted Walpole.

But, whatever may have been their private feuds, the first public offence was undoubtedly given by Pope. In his 'Miscellanies' (1727) Lord Hervey is sneered at in several passages, both covertly and under his initials. In the first edition of the 'Dunciad' (1728) we find—

> "And *high-born* Howard, more majestic sire,
> Impatient waits till * * [*Hervey*] joins the quire."

These were, however, slight touches; and though no one could doubt who was meant, they afforded Hervey no ground of public complaint. But towards the close of 1732 appeared the '*Imitation of the 2nd Satire of the 1st Book of Horace*,' in which Pope attacked Lady Mary by the name of '*Sappho*,' in the most brutal and indecent couplet ever printed, and Lord Hervey twice

over by the contemptuous designation of '*Lord Fanny*.' Pope, indeed, subsequently denied[20] that '*Sappho*' and '*Lord Fanny*' were meant for Lady Mary or his Lordship; but this denial, which everybody saw to be a mean untruth, only put Pope still more in the wrong.

In retaliation for these attacks there soon appeared a sharp retort under the title of '*Verses to the Imitator of Horace*,' which made a great deal of noise, and were generally thought to be the joint production of Lady Mary and Lord Hervey. Lord Wharncliffe, on the faith of "*finding the poem copied into a book verified by her own hand as written by her*," is inclined to conclude that they were hers alone; and they were advertised, and Pope so quotes them, as being written "*by a Lady of Quality*;" but there is, on the other hand, some evidence that would lead to a different conclusion. The original edition (in the Ickworth volume) makes no mention of "*a Lady*" on the title-page, but has a manuscript preface and several manuscript corrections and additions, with a new manuscript title-page, prepared "*by the author*" for a second edition, all of which are in Lord Hervey's own hand. This creates a strong presumption that he was the sole author, though it is perhaps not altogether conclusive, and I must own that these "*Verses*" are smoother, keener, and in every way better than any of Lord Hervey's single-handed productions—except (if that be one) the "*Answer*" to Hammond before mentioned.

---

[20] See 'Letter to a Noble Lord,' November, 1733, in Pope's Works, vol. iii. p. 395 (Bowles's Edition).

I cannot pretend to explain the mystery of those title-pages; but thus much appears in my judgment certain, that the two pieces in connexion with which *the Lady* is mentioned, have a marked superiority over Lord Hervey's other works, both in vigour and polish—and especially over a piece, avowedly by him alone, on the same subject as the '*Verses to the Imitator*,' and published about the same time, entitled, '*Letter from a Nobleman at Hampton Court to a Doctor of Divinity*.' To this piece, which has some strong thoughts in rather rugged metre, the noble author had also made, in the copy at Ickworth, a manuscript addition of half a dozen lines, which I think it right to preserve, as they have not been printed, and as they are a kind of apology for his, as he says, reluctant share in this controversy:—

> "So much for Pope—nor this I would have said,
> Had not the spider first his venom shed;
> For, the *first stone* I ne'er unjustly cast,
> But who can blame the hand that throws the *last*?
> And if one common foe the wretch has made
> Of all mankind—his folly on his head!"

Alas, however, for Lord Hervey, this was not to be the "last stone;" and very different both in weight and impetus was Pope's retort. He in the first instance replied to Lord Hervey by the celebrated prose 'Letter' before mentioned, "which," says Johnson, "though never sent, is printed amongst his letters, but to a cool reader of the present time exhibits nothing but tedious malignity." I cannot agree with Johnson: he was partial to the Herveys.[21] Thomas and Henry, Lord Hervey's

[21] That is after his acquaintance with Henry, who had married his friend Miss Aston: before that he had followed in the track of Pope, and in his

younger brothers, were his friends, and in a small way—but when small things were great to him—his benefactors; and he gratefully told Boswell, "If you call a dog *Hervey*, I shall love him." He therefore took no great pains to understand the sly, deep, and complicated satire of this 'Letter,' which has seemed to other critics one of the most remarkable specimens of ironical sarcasm in our language. From it a patient and intelligent reader may glean every foible, folly, or fault that truth or scandal ever attached to Lord Hervey, brought together with an artful and polished malignity that may be odious, but can never, I think, be "tedious." It remains, however, a much severer weight on the character of Pope than of his antagonist—for it is altogether built on the false and mean denial of what every one knew to be true.

Prudential reasons probably prevented the publication of this libel, of which the affected civility and smooth irony would have probably not deceived a legal tribunal; but Pope took an early opportunity of exhibiting its essence in a form still more striking, more lasting, more brilliant, and to himself more safe. This was the character of *Sporus* (in the *Epistle to Arbuthnot*, published at the close of 1734), which, injurious and unjust as it undoubtedly is, is too large an item in Lord Hervey's history to be omitted even from this sketch:—

> *P.* Let Sporus tremble—
> *A.* What! that thing of silk?
> Sporus! that mere white curd of ass's milk?
> Satire or sense, alas! can Sporus feel?
> Who breaks a butterfly upon a wheel?

'London' had sneered at "*Hervey's jest*," which he afterwards changed to "*Clodio's jest*."

P. Yet let me flap this bug with gilded wings,
This painted child of dirt that stinks and stings!
Whose buzz the witty and the fair annoys;
Yet wit ne'er tastes and beauty ne'er enjoys;
As well-bred spaniels civilly delight
In mumbling of the game they dare not bite.
Eternal smiles his emptiness betray,
As shallow streams run dimpling all the way.
Whether in florid impotence he speaks,
And as the prompter breathes the puppet squeaks;
Or at *the ear of* EVE, familiar toad!
Half froth half venom spits himself abroad,
In pun or politics, or tales, or lies,
Or spite, or smut, or rhymes, or blasphemies.
His wit all see-saw between *that* and *this*,
Now high, now low, now *master* up, now *miss*,
And he himself one vile antithesis.
Amphibious thing! that acting either part,
The trifling head or the corrupted heart,
Fop at the toilet, flatterer at the board,
Now trips a lady, and now struts a lord.
Eve's tempter thus the rabbins have express'd,
A cherub's face—a reptile all the rest!
Beauty that shocks you, parts that none can trust,
Wit that can creep, and pride that licks the dust!"

Though the substance and many of the sharpest points of this bitter invective as well as of the prose 'Letter' were originally taken, as I have said, from Pulteney's libel, the brilliancy is all the poet's own; and it is impossible not to admire, however we may condemn, the art by which *acknowledged* wit, beauty, and gentle manners—the Queen's favour—and even a valetudinary diet, are travestied into the most odious defects and offences. The only trait perhaps of the whole that is not either false or overcharged is Hervey's love for *antithesis*, which Pulteney had already ridiculed. This turn he seems to have inherited from

Lord Bristol, and as the reader of the Memoirs will see, it was habitual in both his writing and speaking. His parliamentary speeches were, as Warton says, very far above "*florid impotence*; but they were in favour of the Ministry, and that was sufficiently offensive to Pope." Smollett too, led away, no doubt, by the satirist, calls his speeches "*pert and frivolous.*" Those that have been preserved are surely of a very different character; and Tindal, a brother historian, rather reproaches them with being too "*grave and solemn.*" But pert speeches, if such they were, and even the foppery and affectation of a young man of fashion, are very subordinate offences, while that more serious defect, which might have been really charged upon him, and which was strongly hinted at in the unpublished 'Letter'—laxity of moral and religious principle—has here altogether—or nearly so—escaped the censure of the satirist. Was it too fashionable and too general—or in the eyes of the friend of Bolingbroke too venial—to be made an object of reproach?

The poetical war slumbered, as far as we know, for some years on the part of Hervey, while Pope took frequently opportunities of insulting both him and his nearest friends; particularly in the satire entitled '1738,' in which Hervey, Stephen and Henry Fox, and even the deceased Queen,[22] were grossly or severely handled; but at last in 1742 his Lordship produced a poem entitled, '*The Difference between Verbal and Practical Virtue, exemplified in some Instances both*

[22] See the two allusions to the Queen in this poem noticed, *post*, i. 473, *n* 9, and ii. 529, *n*. 10.

ancient and modern.' As this poem was not noticed in the controversy which arose some years since on the character of Pope, and as it is now very scarce, the reader may be glad to see a specimen of the last serious effort of Lord Hervey's muse. It begins:—

"What awkward judgments must they make of men
Who think their hearts are pictured by their pen!
Few authors tread the path they recommend,
Or, when they show the road, pursue the end;
Few give examples where they give advice,
Or, though they scourge the vicious, shun the vice."

The ancient instances are *Horace*, *Sallust*, and *Seneca*, whose mean personal conduct he contrasts with the exalted precepts of their writings. The modern example, and that for whose exposure the piece is evidently written, is *Pope*—whose delight it is—

"To cast a shadow o'er the spotless fame,
Or dye the cheek of innocence with shame;
To swell the breast of modesty with care,
Or force from beauty's eye a secret tear;
And, not by decency or honour sway'd,
Libel the living and asperse the dead.
Prone, *where he ne'er received, to give offence*,
But most averse to merit and to sense:
Base to his foe, but baser to his friend;
Lying to blame, and sneering to commend:
Then let him boast that honourable crime
Of making *those who fear not God, fear* HIM,—[23]
When the great honour of that boast is such,
That hornets and mad dogs may boast as much.
Such is th' injustice of his daily theme,
And such the lust that breaks his nightly dream,
That vestal fire of undecaying hate,
Which time's cold tide itself can ne'er abate."

---

[23] "Yes, I am proud, and must be proud to see
Those not afraid of God *afraid of me*."—*Pope*.

This, it must be confessed, is—as to the strength of the bow, whatever we may think of the venom of the shaft—*impar congressus Achilli.*

Coxe, Warton, Bowles, and indeed every other writer (except Smollett), make a generous and substantially a successful defence of Lord Hervey against Pope's malevolence; but where did Coxe find that his Lordship's "*manners and figure were highly forbidding?*" In youth, we have seen, he was eminently handsome; and Pope's lines which so prominently allow him *that* quality were published but eight years before his death. It is true that in 1737, only two years later, the old Duchess of Marlborough, who had now taken a mortal aversion to him, both on personal and political grounds, gives a most unfavourable picture of both his morals and appearance:—

"Lord Hervey is at this time always with the King and in vast favour. He has certainly parts and wit, but is the most wretched profligate man that ever was born, besides ridiculous; a painted face, and not a tooth in his head."—*Opinions.*

Lord Hailes, who published the Duchess's *Opinions*, subjoins to the foregoing passage this note:—

"Lord Hervey having felt some attacks of epilepsy entered upon and practised a very strict regimen, and thus stopped the progress and prevented the effects of that dreadful disease. *His daily food was a small quantity of asses' milk and a flour biscuit; once a week he indulged himself with eating an apple: he used emetics daily.* Mr. Pope and he once were friends, but they quarrelled and persecuted each other with virulent satire. Pope, knowing the abstemious regimen which Lord Hervey observed, was so ungenerous as to call him 'a mere cheese curd of asses' milk.' Lord Hervey used paint to soften his ghastly appearance. Mr. Pope must have known this also, and there-

fore it was unpardonable in him to introduce it into his celebrated portrait."—*Opinions.*

It is possible—and I suppose we must take the angry Duchess's word for it—though we might have hesitated as to the evidence of Pope's poetical epithets—that to paint his face was one of Lord Hervey's fopperies, or it may have been practised, as Lord Hailes suggests, to soften the traces of a constitutional infirmity which he was naturally anxious to conceal. However that may be, there is a portrait of him in the last years of his life, in which his countenance is still very handsome, and the very reverse of either ghastly or forbidding. Lord Hailes's account of his regimen is an exaggeration. It is true that he was subject to epilepsy, and in a letter to Stephen Fox, who, having accompanied him in his sick tour, was no doubt in the secret, he gives the following description of one of these attacks:—

"St. James's, December 7, 1731.

"I have been so very much out of order since I writ last, that going into the Drawing Room before the King, I was taken with one of those disorders with the odious name, that you know happen'd to me once at Lincoln's Inn Fields play-house. I had just warning enough to catch hold of somebody (God knows who) in one side of the lane made for the King to pass through, and stopped till he was gone by. I recovered my senses enough immediately to say, when people came up to me asking what was the matter, that it was a *cramp* took me suddenly in my leg, and (that *cramp* excepted) that I was as well as ever I was in my life. I was far from it; for I saw everything in a mist, was so giddy I could hardly walk, which I said was owing to my *cramp* not quite gone off. To avoid giving suspicion I stayed and talked with people about ten minutes, and then (the Duke of Grafton being there to light the King) came down to my

lodgings, where * * * I am now far from well, but better, and prodigiously pleased, since I was to feel this disorder, that I contrived to do it *à l'insu de tout le monde.* Mr. Churchill was close by me when it happened, and takes it all for a *cramp.* The King, Queen, &c. inquired about my *cramp* this morning, and laughed at it; I joined in the laugh, said how foolish an accident it was, and so it has passed off; nobody but Lady Hervey (from whom it was impossible to conceal what followed) knows anything of it."

For this "disorder" he naturally adopted the remedy of a strict regimen, which, though not quite so strange as stated by Lord Hailes, is sufficiently curious. He writes to his physician, Dr. Cheyne, the celebrated advocate for vegetable diet:—

"St. James's, December 9, 1732.

"* * To let you know that I continue one of your most pious votaries, and to tell you the method I am in. In the first place, I never take wine nor malt drink, or any liquid but water and milk-tea; in the next, I eat no meat but the whitest, youngest, and tenderest, nine times in ten nothing but chicken, and never more than the quantity of a small one at a meal. I seldom eat any supper, but if any, nothing absolutely but bread and water; two days in the week I eat no flesh; my breakfast is dry biscuit not sweet, and green tea; I have left off butter as bilious; I eat no salt, nor any sauce but bread sauce. I take a Scotch pill once a week, and thirty grains of Indian root when my stomach is loaded, my head giddy, and my appetite gone. I have not bragged of the persecutions I suffer in this cause; but the attacks made upon me by ignorance, impertinence, and gluttony are innumerable and incredible."

This really was a heroic sacrifice to Hygæia; but he had to undergo, as we have seen, a still more grievous martyrdom for his abstinence, in Pope's immortal satire.

On the Queen's death he displayed his sorrow and

his scholarship in a long and highly eulogistic epitaph in Latin and in English. In his *Letter to the Doctor of Divinity* he pleads that he

> " long
> Had taken leave of Greek or Latin song,
> All that I learned from Dr. Friend at school,
> By Gradus, Lexicon, or grammar rule,
> Has quite deserted this poor John-Trot head,
> And left plain native English in its stead."

This Pope, in his reply, affected to believe, and ridiculed very successfully his Lordship's confessed want of scholarship—but in truth few men had retained more of, at least, Latinity. He used to correspond in Latin with Henry Fox; his *Epitaphium Reginæ Carolinæ* was approved by very competent scholars; and his correspondence with Dr. Middleton is creditable to his classical learning.

It was, I fear, a community of scepticism that produced, about 1732, an intimate acquaintance and literary correspondence between Lord Hervey and Dr. Middleton. In the early part of 1735, Hervey having proposed to Middleton some questions on the mode of electing the Roman Senate, a regular discussion of that obscure and curious question ensued between them. Middleton published his share of the correspondence in 1747; but Lord Bristol would not permit him to include Lord Hervey's letters. The complete correspondence was, however, printed in 1778, from which it appears that Hervey showed himself by no means Middleton's inferior in the classical studies which had occupied so large a portion of the Doctor's life. Lord Hervey exerted himself with large success

to procure subscribers to Middleton's 'Life of Cicero;'[24] and Middleton showed his gratitude by dedicating the work to his patron in a more laboured panegyric than Hervey's own taste approved, and for which Pope gladly hitched them both into the fourth book of the Dunciad:—

> "Narcissus, praised with all a parson's power,
> Look'd a white lily sunk beneath a shower."

This sarcasm was the last blow of this celebrated conflict, which does little honour to Pope's taste or truth, and not much more to Lord Hervey's talents or temper.

We must now return to his political life. The Memoirs will tell all that is known of it up to the Queen's death. He had been from the outset dissatisfied with his household place; and the loss of *Her* who had distinguished him with peculiar favour, and to whom he was sincerely attached, rendered it additionally irksome, and he pressed Walpole for a change of office, but without any immediate effect. Walpole felt the justice of his claim, and had resolved to bring him into the Cabinet; but was met by a long and vigorous opposition from the Duke of Newcastle, who even threatened to resign rather than submit to so incompatible a colleague.

During this suspense, I find from the private correspondence that he was assiduous in his attendance in the House of Lords, and we have in the *Parl. Hist.* two or three of his speeches on the discussions with

[24] It has been said (Park's *Noble Authors*, iv. 186), on the very loose authority of Seward's Anecdotes, vol. v., p. 78, that the extracts from Cicero's Orations in Middleton's Life were translated by Lord Hervey; but his correspondence with Middleton (preserved at Ickworth) completely disproves any such co-operation: so do Lady Hervey's Letters.

Spain. On one of those occasions, 2nd May, 1738, "a party of Amazons," as Lady Mary W. Montagu calls them, headed by the Duchesses of Queensberry and Ancaster, stormed the House of Lords, and disturbed the debate, "not only by smiles and winks, but by noisy laughs and apparent contempts, which is supposed," she adds, "to be the true reason why poor Lord Hervey spoke so miserably."

At length, however, Walpole overcame the difficulties that had delayed his advancement, and in April, 1740, Lord Godolphin was made Constable of the Tower, and Lord Hervey Privy Seal in his room.

A few memoranda made on his entrance into this new office will be found in a supplemental chapter to the Memoirs; but they are so limited as to have little other value than as a specimen of how Cabinet business was transacted.

It is much to be regretted that Lord Hervey's papers afford us no further insight into either his personal history or the public transactions during the two important years that preceded Walpole's defeat. The ministerial and parliamentary intrigues of that period would have been exceedingly curious and probably important—there is no part of Walpole's history with which we are now so imperfectly acquainted as his decline and fall.

On the assembling of a new Parliament in December, 1741, Sir Robert found himself in repeated minorities, and was forced reluctantly to retire. On the 9th of February he was created Earl of Orford, and on the 11th resigned. Horace Walpole attributes his fall to the *treachery* of his colleagues, and particularly of New-

castle; and we shall see in the following pages evidence enough that Sir Robert and the Duke were latterly on very uncomfortable terms; but Walpole really fell because, from age, indolence, and a too long possession of power, he was ripe for falling. He would, however, have probably fallen somewhat later, if the heir-apparent had not "lent his arm to shake the tree."

Lord Hervey had no inclination, it appears, to follow him in his retreat; and two long letters to his father (in the supplemental chapter) will best explain the circumstances under which—after a long and vigorous struggle either to keep the Privy Seal or to obtain some satisfactory equivalent or compensation for it—he was, on the 12th of July, at length dismissed, and replaced by Lord Gower—who, from being almost a Jacobite, had joined the Whig coalition, to the great scandal of all the Tories and the mortification of at least one of the Whigs.

This reluctance to share the fate of his patron must have seriously offended him; and we cannot wonder that Horace Walpole's *Reminiscences* of this period, derived from Sir Robert, are very unfavourable to Lord Hervey.

"The memorable Lord Hervey had dedicated himself to the Queen, and certainly towards her death had gained great ascendance with her. She had made him Privy Seal; and as he took care to keep as well with Sir Robert Walpole, no man stood in a more prosperous light. But Lord Hervey, who had handled all the weapons of a Court, had also made a deep impression on the heart of the virtuous Princess Caroline; and as there was a mortal antipathy between the Duke of Grafton and Lord Hervey, the Court was often on the point of being disturbed by the enmity of the favourites of the two Princesses.

The death of the Queen deeply affected her daughter Caroline; and the change of the ministry four years after dislodged Lord Hervey, whom, for the Queen's sake, the King would have saved, and who very ungratefully satirized the King in a ballad, as if he had sacrificed him voluntarily. Disappointment, rage, and a distempered constitution carried Lord Hervey off, and overwhelmed his Princess: she never appeared in public after the Queen's death, and being dreadfully afflicted with the rheumatism never stirred out of her apartment, and rejoiced at her own dissolution some years before her father."—*Reminis.*

There is here some inaccuracy. Lord Hervey was not, as we have seen, *made Privy Seal by the Queen*, nor till between two and three years after her death; nor does it seem that he *handled all the weapons of a courtier* with any great advantage to himself, as he continued, notwithstanding his high favour and very distinguished talents, for ten years in the same very subordinate station in which he had begun. The '*Ballad*' alluded to is to be found, under the title of '*The Patriots are come*,' in '*The Foundling Hospital for Wit*,' and was reprinted by Lord Dover in H. Walpole's Letters to Mann, i. 245. Walpole at first doubted from the negligence of the style whether it was Lord Hervey's; but it certainly was. It rallies the new and old courtiers very much in the spirit in which his pamphlets deal with them. The most original line in it is where Carteret is made to say of "*weathercock Pulteney*" that—

> "To cheat such a colleague demands all my arts;
> *For, though he's a fool, he's a fool of great parts.*"

The *ingratitude* to the King on this occasion was not very serious; for in truth his Majesty is treated in the ballad with hardly more freedom than in Lord Her-

vey's direct expostulations pending the negotiation for his removal. It is, however, true that Lord Hervey blames him unjustly both in the correspondence and the ballad for a compliance with circumstances which he had no power to resist.

I do not find any ground, beyond Walpole's assertion, for imputing his death in any degree to "*rage and disappointment.*" For many years his health was so bad, that the only wonder is that he had lasted so long. He was very ill at the time of Walpole's fall, and the crisis seems rather to have revived him. In the short interval between his dismissal and his death he distinguished himself by exertions both in Parliament and in the press, equal, if not superior, to any he had ever made. *They* might be attributed to rage and disappointment, but not his *death.*

The statement as to the Princess Caroline will be elucidated by several passages in the Memoirs; but it is proper to observe that she survived her mother twenty years, and Lord Hervey fourteen; that Walpole himself—who treats the Princess Amelia, in afterlife a personal friend of his own, with so much freedom —negatives the suspicion of any personal impropriety in the attachment of the amiable and "*virtuous*" Caroline to the favourite of her mother, and this evidence seems morally confirmed by the continued affection which Lady Hervey showed for the Princess after her Lord's death.

Of his private life after the change of ministry I find no traces, but in some letters to his old friend and associate Lady Mary Wortley,[25] then at Avignon :—

[25] We owe their preservation, no doubt, to an incident related by Lady Louisa Stuart. "Lord Hervey dying a few years after Lady Mary settled

"Kensington Gravel Pits, May 20 (31), 1742.

"I must now (since you take so friendly a part in what concerns me) give you a short account of my natural and political health; and when I say I am still alive, and still Privy Seal, it is all I can say for the pleasure of one or the honour of the other; for since Lord Orford's retiring, as I am too proud to offer my service and friendship where I am not sure they will be accepted of, and too inconsiderable to have those advances made to me (though I never forgot or failed to return any obligation I ever received), so I remain as illustrious a nothing in this office as ever filled it since it was erected. There is one benefit, however, I enjoy from this loss of my Court interest, which is, that all those flies which were buzzing about me in the summer sunshine and full ripeness of that interest, have all deserted its autumnal decay, and, from thinking my natural death not far off and my political demise already over, have all forgot the deathbed of the one and the coffin of the other. I must let you know, too, that since the death of my

---

abroad, his eldest son (George Lord Hervey) sealed up and sent her her letters with an assurance that none of them had been opened. She wrote him a letter of thanks for his honourable conduct, adding that 'she could almost regret he had not glanced his eye over a correspondence which would have shown him what so young a man might perhaps be inclined to doubt—the possibility of a long and steady friendship subsisting between two persons of different sexes without the least mixture of love.'" (*Works*, i. 66.) I presume that Lady Mary at the same time returned a considerable number of Lord Hervey's which are at Ickworth, and which generally are (as might be expected from letters so preserved and so returned) of the same platonic character—but they belong only to the last fourteen years of an acquaintance that had lasted almost twice as long, and there are here and there a few phrases of a freer kind. In a letter of his (1737), in answer to one of hers in which she seems to have complained that she was too old to inspire a passion, he, after a compliment to her charms more gallant than decorous, goes on to say: "I should think anybody a great fool that said he liked spring better than summer merely because it is further from autumn, or that they loved green fruit better than ripe only because it was further from being rotten. I ever did, and believe ever shall, like woman best

Just in the noon of life—those golden days
When the mind ripens ere the form decays."

Lady Mary was full ripe, being then forty-seven—six years older than he. The lines are from a poem of his own.

mother[26] and my mother-in-law, my circumstances are so easy, or rather indeed affluent, that with regard to my pecuniary interest in being in or out, I am as indifferent as I can be whether my hat is laced or plain; and with regard to any ambitious view, almost as indifferent from age and infirmity about the honour of the one or the look of the other."

These philosophical and self-denying professions are somewhat inconsistent with the strenuous endeavours he was then making to retain office, and the deep resentment which he showed at the loss of it.

Smollett says that "when Lord Hervey and Lord Gower changed places they changed principles. The first was hardened into a sturdy patriot; the other suppled into an obsequious courtier." Lord Hervey immediately took a foremost place in the new Opposition, and never, it seems, spoke better nor was better heard. He opposed the New Gin Act in several speeches, which had a considerable effect, and were separately printed; and Walpole tells us that on the 31st March, 1743, he "spoke for an hour and a half, with the greatest applause, *against* the Hanoverians." He wrote also two able pamphlets, '*Miscellaneous Thoughts on the present Posture of Foreign and Domestic Affairs*' and '*The Question stated with regard to our Army in Flanders.*' The first is a very able exposure of the men and measures of the new administration, and even after this lapse of time may be still read with interest.

But these were his last efforts. On the 15th April, 1743, he writes to Lady Mary:—

---

[26] Lady Bristol died 1st May, 1741.

"St. James's Square.

"I have been confined these three weeks by a fever, which is a sort of annual tax my detestable constitution pays to our detestable climate at the return of every spring; it is now much abated, though not quite gone off. I wrote to you about a month ago, to tell you of my daughter's[27] marriage to the Duchess of Buckingham's grandson; I gave her but 3000*l.*, for which she has 1200*l.* per annum jointure, and the other settlements in proportion. The Duchess of Buckingham is since dead, by which my son-in-law is come into a great inheritance. She has left *me* Buckingham House with all the furniture and all her plate for my life, but I am so well lodged where I am that I have no thoughts of removing. Adieu! my head is still so weak that it turns round with what I have written. I will write again when I grow stronger. The public affairs are in a strange posture; and I believe you know as much of them where you are, and what we would be at, as any minister in the cabinet. I am sure I know no more than if I had been born an idiot."

The following is the last letter of this correspondence, and, judging by the date as well as by the feebleness and tremor of the hand, was evidently one of the last he ever wrote:—

"Ickworth Park, June 18, 1743.

"The last stages of an infirm life are filthy roads, and like all other roads I find the farther one goes from the capital the more tedious the miles grow and the more rough and disagreeable the way. I know of no turnpikes to mend them; medicine pretends to be such, but doctors who have the management of it, like the commissioners for most other turnpikes, seldom execute what they undertake: they only put the toll of the poor cheated passenger in their pockets, and leave every jolt at least as bad as they found it, if not worse. 'May all your ways (as Solomon says of wisdom) be ways of pleasantness, and all your

[27] Lepell, his eldest daughter, married to Mr. Constantine Phipps, afterwards Lord Mulgrave: "a fine black girl," says H. Walpole, "but as masculine as her father ought to be."—*Lett.* 7 January, 1742.

paths peace;' and when your dissolution must come, may it be like that of your lucky workman.[28] Adieu!"

On the 8th August, 1743, he died; and his death was thus recorded in the 'London Magazine:'—

"*Died.*—The Right Honourable John Lord Hervey, late Lord Privy Seal, and eldest son of the Earl of Bristol; a famous speaker in Parliament under the late administration and in the Opposition to the present."

With regard to one who deals so freely with the actions and motives of others, and who is likely to become an historical authority, I have thought it my duty and have endeavoured to bring before my readers, with perfect impartiality, all the circumstances that seemed most likely to guide them to a true appreciation of his own character—I have submitted to them the grounds upon which any opinion of mine could be formed, and I shall therefore not further venture to anticipate their judgment of the man, than to remind them that almost all we know of him has been transmitted by the ablest and bitterest personal and political enemies, whose charges are obviously and assuredly liable to large abatements; while on the other side we have the accidental and less detailed, but infinitely more important, evidence of the undeviating approbation and affection of his excellent father, and the fond and long-enduring attachment to his person and his memory of his admirable wife.

Lord Bristol survived this deeply-felt loss to the 20th January, 1751; and Lady Hervey to the 2nd September, 1768.

[28] Lady Mary was altering an old mill near Avignon into a kind of Belvedere, and I suppose one of her workmen had died in some enviable way.

It is now necessary to add a few words upon the Memoirs themselves.

Lord Hervey himself fairly admits that impartiality in such cases as his is not to be expected, and he justifies that confession to its fullest extent; but though we see that his colouring may be capricious and exaggerated—no one can feel the least hesitation as to the substantial and, as to mere facts, the minute accuracy of his narrative. He may, and I have no doubt too often does, impute a wrong motive to an act, or a wrong meaning to a speech; but we can have no doubt that the act or the speech themselves are related as he saw and heard them: and there are many indications that the greater part was written from day to day as the events occurred.

I know of no such near and intimate picture of the interior of a court; no other memoirs that I have ever read bring us so immediately, so actually into not merely the presence, but the company of the personages of the royal circle. Lord Hervey is, may I venture to say, almost the *Boswell* of George II. and Queen Caroline—but Boswell without his good nature. He seems to have taken—perhaps under the influence of that "wretched health" of which he so frequently complained—a morbid view of mankind, and to have had little of the milk of human kindness in his temper.

In a '*Satire*' of his, 'after the *manner of Persius*,' in *Dodsley's Collection*, we find the commonplace invectives against mankind, sharpened with something of more personal misanthropy:—

> "Mankind I know, their nature and their art,
> Their vice their own, their virtue but a *part*
> Ill played so oft, that all the cheat can tell,
> And dangerous only when 'tis acted well."

And, after a long tirade in this style, he adds:—

> "To such reflections when I turn my mind,
> *I loathe my being, and abhor mankind.*"

And, in fact, whether in his *jeux d'esprit*, his graver verses, his pamphlets, or his memoirs, satire—perhaps I might say *detraction*—seems to have been, as with Horace Walpole, the natural bias of his mind. There is, I think, in all his writings, no one of whom he speaks uniformly and heartily well, or to whom he is willing to allow a good motive for anything they say or do, but his father and the Princess Caroline. It must be owned few others of his personages deserved it so well: but the result is that all his portraits, not excepting even his own, are of the *Spagnoletto* school.

A more impartial painter might, without concealing or extenuating the prejudices, frailties, or faults of George II., have allowed him honour, honesty, truth, good intentions, and substantial good sense. I do not mean to say that Lord Hervey deviates in any particular from truth, or even exaggerates the King's defects; but the sketches of his Majesty's character which we have by Lords Chesterfield and Waldegrave and Lady M. W. Montagu, all close and certainly not partial observers, seem to prove that Lord Hervey had a strong personal dislike to the King, and has done scanty justice to his good qualities.

I also cannot but think that, had he not been so deeply prejudiced against Frederick Prince of Wales, the character of the Queen—the person whom of all others he seems disposed to treat most favourably—would have appeared in more amiable colours. Lord Hervey gives us (may I not say?) an odious and un-

natural picture of the animosity of a mother against her son, without explaining in any way its original cause, and often, I think, omitting, perhaps disguising, some recurrence of maternal feeling. In what way Prince Frederick had at first (and even, as it seems, before he came to England) alienated the affection of his parents, no one has yet guessed; and these Memoirs, which so strongly exhibit the animosity, afford (contrary to Lord Hailes's expectation) nothing like a sufficient reason for it. After he came to England, and fell into the hands of the Opposition, we see abundant causes of estrangement, and yet even then not enough to justify such extreme resentment as the Memoirs ascribe, and no doubt truly, to the parents. There is a circumstance, however, which may have influenced the later stages of the quarrel, which Lord Hervey does not notice, and to which, but for his silence, I should be inclined to attribute some influence.

There was published in the year 1735 a small volume called '*Histoire du Prince Titi: A[llegorie] R[oyale]*.' Two translations of it, under the title of '*The History of Prince Titi, a royal allegory, in three parts: with an Essay on Allegorical Writing, and a Key, by the Hon. Mrs. Stanley,*' were advertised in February, 1736. In this work (as is stated in the last edition of Boswell's Johnson, p. 461, n. 4), "amidst the puerility and nonsense of a very stupid fairy tale, it is clear enough that, under the names of Prince *Titi*, King *Ginguet*, and Queen *Tripasse*, are meant Prince Frederick, George II., and Queen Caroline;" and to this I may add that the title *Allegorie Royale* and portraits, not to be mistaken, of the two Walpoles[29] as ministers of *Ginguet*,

[29] For instance, the following description of old Horace might pass for a

and allusions to the younger brother, and even to the important secret of the design of placing him on the throne,[30] leave no doubt as to what was meant —wherever there is any meaning. Those acquainted with the *lingua balatronica*, or *vulgar dictionary* of France, know that the application of the term *Ginguet* to the King and of *Tripasse* to the Queen were gross personal insults, and, from a combination of circumstances, peculiarly so to the Queen.[31] The French author to whom this work is attributed, one Themiseul de St. Hyacinthe, was what is called a bookseller's hack, and it is known that he spent the couple of years immediately preceding the publication in London, where, no doubt, this absurd but offensive romance was concocted. I know of no copy in England of the original French but one in the British Museum, and that is of only the first of *three* parts.[32] My best diligence

translation of what Lord Hervey says of him, *post*, i. 324:—" On chargea de cet ambassade le frère du Premier Ministre. Ce frère étoit un échappé de paysan. Il avoit été employé en différens négociations par le crédit du Ministre; mais il n'avoit fait qu'ajouter à sa rusticité naturelle l'arrogance que donnent les grandes places. Il faisoit le gausseur et le diseur de bon mots. Ce n'étoient que des grossièretés qu'on lui passoit à causes de ses emplois, et que ne servoient qu'à rendre sa personne plus méprisable."

[30] " La Reine était désespérée de voir qu'elle n'osait tenter de faire publiquement déclarer Titi déchu de ses droits à la couronne pour la faire passer sur la tête de son frère cadet *quoique l'acte en fut formellement dressé.*" See the explanation of this passage *post*, ii. 417.

[31] Ginguet means, in its different applications, *sour*, *short*, or *shabby*. *Tripasse* I can only venture to explain by saying that it is equivalent to the coarsest term that Prince Henry gives, in one of the tavern scenes (1 Hen. IV. ii. 4), to the *obesity* of Falstaff.

[32] There is a perfect copy in the national library in Paris; and the whole of this tedious and nearly unintelligible stuff is reprinted, to the extent of six or seven hundred octavo pages, in the *Cabinet des Fées* (Paris, 1784-6) under the notion that St. Hyacinthe's work was really meant for a *fairy tale*, and it has been abridged in at least one later collection into about thirty pages, containing all of the original which has any resemblance to a *Fairy* tale. I know not whether there ever was any genuine child's story, under the title of *Prince Titi*, on which Prince Frederick or

has not been able to find either of the English translations, and I am therefore inclined to suspect the whole were *bought up*. We are told (*Park's 'Noble Authors,'* i. 171) that '*MS. Memoirs of his own Time*,' written by Prince Frederick, under the name of Prince Titi—perhaps the original of the work before published, or a continuation or amplification of it—were, after the Prince's death, given up by the executors of Ralph, his secretary, to the Princess-Dowager. But whatever the manuscript may have been, it is certain that the printed book exists; and if the King—and above all the Queen—knew of it (and can we doubt that they did?), they must have resented in the highest degree a libel, of which the "stupidity and childish absurdity" would not, to them at least, have counterbalanced its indecency and insult. I am surprised at finding no allusion whatsoever to this work in Lord Hervey's Memoirs; for I should have supposed that he—curious in literary scandal—must have known it. He may perhaps have had some special motive for not alluding to it; or perhaps his notice of it may have occurred in one of the passages relating to the dissensions of the Royal Family which have been destroyed. All this, however, I submit to my readers' judgment, as the best—though still a very unsatisfactory—conjecture I can make on this mysterious subject.

In another point also these Memoirs give an impression as to Queen Caroline very injurious to her cha-

St. Hyacinthe embroidered the *Allegorie Royale*. I have not discovered any. It is observable that when the editor of the *Cabinet des Fées* adopted this as a fairy tale, he changed the offensive name given in the original to the Queen from *Tripasse* to *Tripalle*, and the subsequent editor omitted the name altogether.

racter—and which, if truth is ever to be veiled, might have been spared on this occasion. The general fact is from many other sources too notorious, but the details are odious. The motive which Lord Hervey, Horace Walpole, and Lord Chancellor King suggest for the Queen's complaisance—that she did it to preserve her power over her husband—would be, in truth, the reverse of an excuse. But may not a less selfish motive be suggested? What could she have done? The immoralities of kings have been always too leniently treated in public opinion; and in the precarious possession which the Hanoverian family were thought to have of the throne until the failure of the rebellion of 1745—could the Queen have prudently or safely taken measures of resistance, which must have at last ended in separation or divorce, or at least a scandal great enough, perhaps, to have overthrown her dynasty; and in such a course her *prudery*, as it might have been called, would probably have met little sympathy in those dissolute times. But even in this case we must regret that she had not devoured her own humiliation and sorrow in absolute silence, and submitted discreetly, and without confidants, to what she could not effectually resist. But neither the selfish motives imputed by former writers, nor the extenuating circumstance of *expediency* which I thus venture to suggest, can in any degree excuse the indulgence and even encouragement given, as we shall see, on her death-bed to the King's vices; and we are forced, on the whole, to conclude that moral delicacy as well as Christian duty must have had very little hold on either her mind or heart. I have ventured to say (*post*, vol. ii. p. 528) that "she had read and argued

herself into a very low and cold species of Christianity;" but Lord Chesterfield (who, however, personally disliked her) goes rather farther, and says,—"After puzzling herself with all the whimsies and fantastical speculations of different sects, she fixed herself ultimately in *deism*—believing in a future state. Upon the whole the *agreeable woman* was liked by most people, while the *Queen* was neither esteemed, beloved, nor trusted by any one but the King."

In the general aspect of the Memoirs, the first thing that will strike every reader conversant with the history of the time is, their extraordinary coincidence with and confirmation of Horace Walpole's *Reminiscences*, *Letters*, and *Memoirs*. I have long balanced on the question whether Walpole had seen these Memoirs. We are told by Mr. Bowles that Mr. Hans Stanley had read them. This is very probable. Mr. Stanley was a particular friend of Lady Hervey's, but not more so than Walpole; and I do not think she would have refused the son of Sir Robert an indulgence which she allowed to Mr. Stanley; particularly as she must certainly have contributed to the '*Royal and Noble Authors*' the list of Lord Hervey's works in which the Memoirs are mentioned. It is also to be remarked that the anecdotes of these Memoirs and the *Reminiscences* are so frequently identical, or differing only by such slight variations, as to create a strong impression that they must have been derived from the same source. On the other hand, it must be recollected that Horace professes to have heard all those matters from Sir Robert—from whom

also Lord Hervey heard the most of what he did not himself see and to whom he repeated all that he had in Sir-Robert's absence observed; and there are some instances in which the narratives differ, without contradicting each other, in circumstances which could hardly have varied if Horace had been *copying* Hervey. But whichever way our opinions may incline upon this point, the result must be to confer on Walpole's anecdotes much more credit for authenticity and accuracy than they have hitherto had. I for one must confess, that most of my former doubts of Walpole's accuracy have been entirely removed by Lord Hervey's Memoirs; and that, on the other hand, there are some things in the Memoirs which I should have deemed incredible, if we had not been in some measure prepared for them by the previous revelations of Walpole.

Of my own small share in the following pages I have little to say. My notes may to different readers appear too many, or too few, or not of the right sort; but they are such as I thought might be convenient to an ordinary reader, and as I myself would have been glad to find in a publication of this kind—errors of course excepted, of which I fear there may be more than I have corrected in the errata. I have not deemed it my duty to excuse, controvert, or enforce my author's statements or opinions, though I hope I shall be forgiven for having in a few special instances ventured to point out a mistake or endeavoured to correct an injustice; but, as a general rule, I have attempted illustration rather than comment.

J. W. C.

Autograph of Lord Hervey.
Part of a Letter to his Mother.

Lar Territorys, till I could doe it as our Embaſsadors doe their's into the Emperor of Morrocco's, wth my Presents in my Hand.

Your Ladyps not being able to read this Letter will be no great Loſs either to your-self or me; if I had the Vanity to think it would, I should retire to a quiet Room to write it over; Dr Arbuthnot, Mr Pulteney, George, a Drum, & a Coach & Horses make such a noiſe in this, that I can be sure of having say'd what I intend, only when I aſsure your Ladyp I am

Madam

Your Ladyps

most obedient

Son & Servant

HERVEY.

Lady Hervey desires her Duty to your Ladyp & my Lord.

SOME MATERIALS

TOWARDS

MEMOIRS OF THE REIGN

OF

KING GEORGE THE SECOND.

CHAPTER I.

Introduction—State and Views of Parties at the death of George I.: Whigs, Tories, Hanoverians, Jacobites—Characters of Pulteney, Bolingbroke, Walpole, and Wyndham.

BOASTING of intelligence and professing impartiality are such worn-out prefaces to writings of this kind, that I shall not trouble my readers nor myself with any very long exordium upon these topics; all I shall say for my intelligence is, that I was lodged all the year round in the Court,[1] during the greater part of these times concerning which I write; and as nobody attended more constantly in public, or had more frequent access at private hours to all the inhabitants, I must have been deaf and blind not to have heard and seen several little particularities which must necessarily be unknown to such of my contemporaries as were only acquainted

[1] He means, that while most of the royal household waited *periodically*, *his* attendance was constant. The apartments in the Palaces assigned to the members of the Household were called *lodgings*.

with the chief people of this Court in the theatrical pageantry of their public characters, and never saw them when that mask of constraint and hypocrisy, essential to their stations, was enough thrown off for some natural features to appear.

As to my being partial, whatever professions I make to disclaim it can be of no weight, since whoever is so must always be it, either without knowing or without owning it. To confess it would be to defeat the purpose for which they are so. But as it is generally flattery or interest which makes people either partial or dishonest in their reports, I am certainly under neither of these influences, as it will be impossible for me to publish these memoirs whilst I live, and consequently I should gain no advantage from my hostility nor reap any reward for my flattery. Those who expect I should be very choice in my language or methodical in my arrangement, will be extremely mistaken, for I seek rather to please people's curiosity than to promote my own reputation; to inform rather than to be praised; and shall set things of public and of private, national and personal, foreign and domestic concern, promiscuously down just as they occur, without troubling myself about the accuracy of the style in which I relate them, or the chronological exactness in which I range them.

The things that might be commonly known I shall conclude too are so, and may therefore perhaps often neglect reciting what is as public as the contents of a gazette, though it might be thought necessary to illustrate the accounts I shall give of more private transactions, and connect little incidents less likely to be inserted in all other records of this reign.

As to the disagreeable egotisms with which almost all memoir-writers so tiresomely abound, I shall endeavour to steer as clear of them as I can, and whenever I must give into them, I shall have recourse to the old refuge of speaking always of myself in the third person, in order to make them less glaring, and to prevent the natural imputation of pursuing the thread of my history of others, only from a foolish vanity and impertinent desire of troubling the world with my own, which, indeed, would be of as little use to me as to my readers, and conduce no more to my profit than to their entertainment. I leave those ecclesiastical heroes of their own romances—De Retz and Burnet—to aim at that useless imaginary glory of being thought to influence every considerable event they relate; and I very freely declare that my part in this drama was only that of the Chorus's in the ancient plays, who, by constantly being on the stage, saw everything that was done, and made their own comments upon the scene, without mixing in the action or making any considerable figure in the performance.

Thus much I thought it right to say with regard to what I propose in undertaking this work and the manner in which I intend to pursue it; and as factions and party have in all ages been the principal engine in all governments, and as they are generally of most force where the state is most free, I think it will not be improper to add to this exordium a short account of the factions and parties subsisting in England at the era I have chosen for the commencement of these memoirs.

WHIG and TORY had been the denominations by which men opposite in their political views had distinguished themselves for many years and through many reigns. Those who were called Whigs had been in power from the first accession of the Hanover Family to the Crown; but the original principles on which both these parties were said to act, altered so insensibly in the persons who bore the names, by the long prosperity of the one, and the adversity of the other, that those who called themselves Whigs arbitrarily gave the title of Tory to every one who opposed the measures of the administration, or whom they had a mind to make disagreeable at Court; whilst the Tories (with more justice) reproached the Whigs with acting on those very principles and pushing those very points which, to ingratiate themselves with the people and to assume a popular character, they had at first set themselves up to explode and abuse.

The two chief characteristics of the Tories originally were the maintenance of the prerogative of the Crown and the dignity of the Church; both which they pretended were now become, if not by profession, at least by practice, much more the care of the Whigs. Nor were the Whigs quite innocent of this imputation; long service and favour had gradually taught them a much greater complaisance to the Crown than they had formerly paid to it, and the power of the Crown being an engine at present in their own hands, they were not very reluctant to keep up an authority they exercised, and support the prerogative which was their own present though precarious possession. The assistance likewise

which the Whigs in power had received from the bench of bishops in parliamentary affairs, had made them show their gratitude in return, by supporting both them and the inferior clergy in all ecclesiastical concerns (except the suffering the Convocation to sit), with as much vigour and firmness as the most zealous of those who are called the Church Party could have done. The increase of the army and civil list, the repeated suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, and frequent votes of credit in the late reign, were further instances that were often and not unreasonably given by the Tories of the Whigs deviating in their conduct from their original profession and principles.

Both Whigs and Tories were subdivided into two parties: the Tories into Jacobites and what were called Hanover Tories; the Whigs into patriots and courtiers, which was in plain English "*Whigs in place*" and "*Whigs out of place.*" The Jacobite party was fallen so low, from the indolence of some, the defection of others, and the despair of all, that in reality it consisted only of a few veterans (and those very few) who were really Jacobites by principle, and some others who, educated in that calling, made it a point of honour not to quit the name, though their attachment to the person of the Pretender was not only weakened but, properly speaking, entirely dissolved—their consciences quiet about his title, and their reverence to his character, their compassion for his misfortunes, and their hopes of his success quite worn out.

That which kept this party still alive, and gave it that little weight it yet retained in the kingdom, was, that all those who were by private views piqued at the

administration without being disaffected to the government joined the Jacobites in Parliament, and pushed the same points, though on different motives; these only designing to distress the ministers, and those catching at anything that might shake the establishment of the Hanover family, and tend to the subversion of the whole.

By these means men oftentimes seemed united in their public conduct who differed as much in their private wishes and views from one another as they did from those they opposed; and whilst they acted in concert together, both thought they were playing only their own game, and each looked upon the other as his dupe.

This was the state of the Jacobite party at the death of the late King [George I.], and without these recruits, raised by the defection of Whigs upon interested motives and contention for power, I am of opinion that the Pretender's party would by that time have been as dead in this kingdom as if he himself had been so. The little interest he had in any Court abroad made his partisans expect little external assistance, and the notion of hereditary right at home had been so long ridiculed and exploded, that there were few people whose loyalty was so strong, or whose understanding was so weak, as to retain and act upon it. The conscientious attachment to the natural right of this or that king, and the religious reverence to God's anointed, was so far eradicated by the propagation of revolutionary principles, that mankind was become much more clear-sighted on that score than formerly, and so far comprehended and gave into the doctrine of a king being made for the people and not the people for the king, that in all their steps it was the interest of the nation or the interest of par-

ticular actors that was considered, and never the separate interest of one or the other king. And though one might be surprised (if any absurdity arising from the credulity and ignorance of mankind could surprise one) how the influence of power could ever have found means to establish the doctrine of Divine right of kings, yet no one can wonder that the opinion lost ground so fast when it became the interest even of the princes on the throne for three successive reigns to expel it. The clergy, who had been paid for preaching it up, were now paid for preaching it down; the Legislature had declared it of no force in the form of our government, and contrary to the fundamental laws and nature of our Constitution; and what was more prevailing than all the rest, it was no longer the interest of the majority of the kingdom either to propagate or act on this principle, and consequently those who were before wise enough from policy to teach it, were wise enough now from the same policy to explode it; and those who were weak enough to take it up only because they were told it, were easily brought to lay it down by the same influence.

It will not be difficult, from what has been said of the state of party at this juncture in England, to perceive that the chief struggle now lay, not between Jacobites and Hanoverians, or Tories and Whigs, but between Whigs and Whigs, who, conquerors in the common cause, were now split into civil contest among themselves, and had no considerable opponents but one another.

The heads of these two Whig parties were Sir Robert Walpole and Mr. Pulteney.[2] The first was Chancellor

[2] Walpole was born 26th August, 1676; and educated at Eton and King's

of the Exchequer, First Commissioner of the Treasury, and Prime Minister. The other had been Secretary-at-War; disgraced, retaken into the administration as Cofferer, but failing in his endeavours to be made Secretary of State [*on Lord Carteret's retiring in* 1724], had set himself at the head of the opposition to the Court, and meditated nothing but the ruin of Sir Robert Walpole, to whose account he placed the irremissible sin of putting the Duke of Newcastle into that employment he had pretended to.

The reasons why Sir Robert Walpole had given the preference to the Duke upon this occasion, I believe were these:—He thought his Grace's quality and estate,

---

College, Cambridge. He came into Queen Anne's first Parliament for Lynn, for which he sat till his peerage. In 1708 he succeeded St. John as Secretary-at-War, and in 1710 became Treasurer of the Navy. On the change of ministry he was accused, and by the House of Commons voted guilty, of corruption in the War Office, expelled the House and sent to the Tower. On the accession of George I. he was appointed Paymaster of the Forces, and in October, 1715, First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Townshend, his brother-in-law, being Secretary of State, and considered as First Minister. In April, 1717, they were overthrown by Lord Sunderland, and Walpole went into strong opposition; but in June, 1720, was re-appointed Paymaster, and employed (insidiously, it was suspected) by Lord Sunderland to repair the mischiefs of the South Sea scheme: in which, however, Sunderland himself was found to be implicated, and being forced to resign, Walpole was re-appointed (April, 1721) First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer: in these offices he continued till 1742, when he was out-voted in Parliament, resigned, and was created Earl of Orford, and died on the 18th March, 1745, æt. sixty-eight. At the commencement of these Memoirs in 1727 he was therefore about fifty-one.

William Pulteney was born in 1682, elected into Queen Anne's last Parliament, and, on the King's accession, made Secretary-at-War; dismissed, with Walpole and Townshend, in 1717; made Cofferer of the Household in 1723, but resigned next year, as stated in the text; and thenceforward became and continued leader of the Opposition till 1742, when, like his great antagonist, he retired to the House of Lords, and the Earl of Bath soon sank into neglect, and almost oblivion. He died in 1762: at the commencement of the Memoirs he was forty-five.

his popularity in the country, and the great influence he had in Parliament by the number of boroughs he commanded, were qualifications and appurtenances that would always make him a useful friend to any minister; and looked upon his understanding to be such as could never let him rise into a dangerous rival. Mr. Pulteney he knew was a man of parts, but not to be depended upon; one capable of serving a minister, but more capable of hurting him from desiring only to serve himself. He was a man of most inflexible pride, immeasurable ambition, and so impatient of any superiority, that he grudged the power of doing good even to his benefactor, and envied the favour of the Court to one who called him in to share it. He had as much lively ready wit as ever man was master of; and was, before politics soured his temper and engrossed his thoughts, the most agreeable and coveted companion of his time: he was naturally lazy, and continued so till he was out of employment: his resentment and eagerness to annoy first taught him application; application gave him knowledge, but knowledge did not give him judgment, nor experience, prudence: he was changeable in his wishes, vehement in the pursuit of them, and dissatisfied in the possession. He had strong passions; was seldom sincere but when they ruled him: cool and unsteady in his friendships, warm and immovable in his hate: naturally not generous, and made less so by the influence of a wife whose person he loved, but whose understanding and conduct neither had nor deserved his good opinion, and whose temper both he and every other body abhorred—a weak woman with all the faults of a bad man; of low birth, a lower mind, and the lowest man-

ners, and without any one good, agreeable, or amiable quality but beauty.[3]

It was very remarkable in Mr. Pulteney, that he never liked the people with whom he acted chiefly in his public character, nor loved those with whom he passed his idler hours. Sir Robert Walpole, with whom he was first leagued, he has often declared both in public and in private, in conversation and in print, he never esteemed; and Lord Bolingbroke, with whom he was afterwards engaged, neither he nor any other body could esteem. Lord Chesterfield and Mr. George Berkeley,[4] with whom he lived in the most seeming intimacy, he mortally hated; but continued that seeming intimacy long after he did so, merely from a refinement of pride, and an affectation of being blind to what nobody else could help seeing. They had both made love to his wife, and though, I firmly believe, both unsuccessfully, yet many were of a contrary opinion; for her folly, her vanity, her coquetry, had given her husband the same jealousy, and the world the same suspicion, as if she had gone all those lengths in private, which her public conduct, without one's being very credulous, would naturally have led one to believe.

---

[3] Anna Maria Gumley. Sir C. H. Williams treats her very disrespectfully: Pulteney, he says,—in becoming Lord Bath,—

"—— trucked the fairest fame
For a right honourable name
To call his *vixen* by."

And, again, he calls her "*Bath's ennobled Doxy*," and has several allusions to her stinginess and corruption; but her personal beauty was universally admitted.

[4] Youngest son of the second Earl of Berkeley, M.P. for Dover from 1720 to 1734, and for Hedon, by Pulteney's influence, from 1734 to his death in 1746; second husband of Lady Suffolk.

Between Mr. Pulteney and Sir William Wyndham (the head of the Hanover Tories and his colleague in all public affairs) there was such a serious rivalry for reputation in oratory, interest with particulars,[5] knowledge in business, popularity in the country, weight in Parliament, and the numbers of their followers, that the superior enmity they bore to men in power alone hindered that which they felt to one another from *eclating*.

Lord Hervey lived in friendship and intimacy with him many years, but the manner in which Mr. Pulteney broke with him[6] showed that his attachment there was not much deeper rooted in his heart than that artificial kindness he wore towards those who deserved no real affection at his hands.

Those who thought that Mr. Pulteney was never good-humoured, pleasing, honourable, friendly, and benevolent, knew him not early; those who never thought him otherwise, knew him not long; for no two men ever differed more from one another, in temper, conduct, and character, than he from himself in the compass of a few years.

From what has been said, it will be easy to perceive there were many ingredients in Mr. Pulteney's composition that might deter Sir Robert Walpole from making such a man Secretary of State; but one very material objection, besides what has already been mentioned, I believe was this:—

When, in 1724, the animosity between Lord Towns-

---

[5] A Gallicism—*particuliers*—for "individual" or "private persons." It is frequent throughout these Memoirs.

[6] We shall see by and by that the quarrel arose from a difference in politics on Lord Hervey's joining Walpole, which ripened into a war of scurrilous pamphlets, and a duel (25 January, 1731) between these former friends.

hend and Lord Carteret, the two Secretaries of State at that time, was grown to such a height that it was impossible for them to serve longer together, and that each of them was struggling to subvert the other, Mr. Pulteney thought, by his dexterity, so to manage his affairs that, whoever was the sacrifice, he should be the successor: to this end he entered into a secret correspondence and treaty with Lord Carteret, of which Sir Robert Walpole got intelligence, and from that moment resolved, since Mr. Pulteney had endeavoured to secure himself an entrance at this other door in case it was opened, that at least he should never come in where he held the key.

It is very possible that I may be thought to dwell too long upon this part of my introduction; but as the *anger of this Achilles* made so considerable a figure, and for so long a time, in England, I thought the particulars of its rise, and the whole character of this remarkable and, with all his imperfections, certainly great man, would not be an unsatisfactory digression to posterity.

And since I look upon this introduction as a sort of *Dramatis Personæ* to the following work, and that the chief actors in the political part of it are Sir Robert Walpole and Mr. Pulteney, Sir William Wyndham and Lord Bolingbroke, I shall add a short sketch also of the three other characters,—at least so far as shall enable the reader to guess, by what passed antecedent to this reign, the distant springs and causes of many events that happened in it.

Lord Bolingbroke[7] was first employed, in Queen

[7] Bolingbroke was born in 1678 (not 1672, as commonly supposed) and died in 1751. He was now about forty-nine.

Anne's reign, by the Duke of Marlborough and the Lord Treasurer Godolphin, whom he abandoned at the change of her Whig ministry. He was again brought into business and power by the Lord Treasurer Oxford, whom he undermined, supplanted in the Queen's favour, and turned out. Few people disputed, and fewer still doubted, his having been in the Pretender's interest before the death of the Queen. As soon as the Hanover family came to the Crown, he was impeached of high treason, did not dare to stand his trial, fled, and was attainted. He then entered immediately, publicly, and avowedly, into the Pretender's service, but was soon discarded by him, and returned to France. The occasion of this disgrace was said to be his having betrayed the Pretender in order to gain his pardon at the Court of England. But as this was a fact difficult in its nature to be proved against him by those who were not concerned in it, and very improper to be proved by those who were, he always denied it, though without convincing anybody that he was guiltless of the charge.

The Queen herself told me, eight years after she came to the Crown, that Madame de Villette,[8] at Leicester-house, had made a merit to her of Lord Bolingbroke's having entered into the Pretender's service, because she said he had done it with no other view than to serve the Court of London, and earn his pardon. "That was, in short (said the Queen, when she told me this),

[8] Marie Claire Deschamps de Marcilly, niece of Madame de Maintenon and widow of the Marquis de Villette, second wife of Lord Bolingbroke. The marriage, secret and even disclaimed, as we shall see, for some years, was thought to have taken place soon after the death of the first Lady Bolingbroke in October 1718.

to *betray* the Pretender; for though Madame de Villette softened the word, she did not soften the thing; which I own (continued the Queen) was a speech that had so much villainy and impudence mixed in it, that I could never bear him nor her from that hour; and could hardly hinder myself from saying to her—'And pray, Madam, what security can the King have that my Lord Bolingbroke does not desire to come here with the same honest intent that he went to Rome? Or that he swears he is no longer a Jacobite with more truth than you have sworn you are not his wife.'"[9] That Lady Bolingbroke made this confession to the Queen, I learned, as I have said before, from the Queen herself; and it was universally believed that he betrayed the Pretender. It is very sure that from that period the stanch Jacobites always hated and vilified him as much as the stanchest Whigs. Everybody knew that in Lord Sunderland's administration, and by his mediation, Lord Bolingbroke obtained the King's pardon, and (as he pretended) an absolute promise of the full reversal of his attainder, with the restitution of his honour and estate; but on what conditions and for what consideration he could receive this full forgiveness, and even promise of reward, those who deny his having betrayed the Pretender would be puzzled to say: for the twelve thousand pounds given by Madame de Villette (niece to Madame de Maintenon), whom he married in France, to Lady Walsingham (niece[10] to the King's mistress, the

[9] The explanation of this circumstance will appear in p. 16.

[10] Or, as was rather suspected, her *daughter*, by George I. She was created Countess of Walsingham in 1722, married the celebrated Lord Chesterfield in 1733, and died in 1778.

Duchess of Kendal), was never paid, nor offered, nor negotiated for, till seven years after this promise was obtained. Lord Sunderland died [1722]; but Lord Bolingbroke, notwithstanding, came back to England in 1723, by virtue of an Act of Parliament, which enabled him to inherit his father's estate, but did not restore his dignity, and entailed the estate, in case he had not children, on his brother, leaving him a power of raising no more than 10,000*l.* upon it. Sir Robert Walpole was then at the head of the Ministry, and on him fell all the resentment of Lord Bolingbroke for this failure in two such material articles of what he pretended had been promised him; though it is certain the King never owned he had made such a promise; and if he had, the cry of the whole nation at that time ran so strong against Lord Bolingbroke, that most people were then of opinion, if it had been proposed in Parliament, it would not only have shaken the Whig interest, by splitting and tearing the party to pieces, but have proved too much for the influence of the Court to have carried through, as omnipotent as some at that time might imagine it.

Madame de Villette, who was then in England soliciting his cause at Court, instead of being satisfied with the bargain of this Act of Parliament for her 12,000*l.*, carried her resentment of it so high that she declared publicly to every one she met, that the Ministers had not only made the King break his word, but had so clogged and loaded what they called benefits, *que les faveurs du Roi étoient des affronts;* and that if she knew Lord Bolingbroke at all, she was sure he had rather live an exile all his days than submit to an im-

perfect restoration on such cramped, dishonourable terms. The sequel showed she either did not know him, or pretended not to know him; for home he came, and only on these terms. The first thing he did when he came to England was so like the last thing he did before he left it, that—notwithstanding all the declarations he made of his ambition being quite extinct—of his seeking and desiring nothing but quiet, oblivion, retirement, and a harbour from the political storms in which he had been so long tossed—he began immediately to enter anew into Court intrigues, Parliamentary cabals, and paper war, and retrace all the paths that had before brought him to the brink of ruin. He began again, by pamphlets, to attack the conduct of public affairs, both foreign and domestic; to endeavour to turn the persons of those concerned in the administration into ridicule, their understandings into contempt, and their actions into errors and crimes. Soon after his return, he acknowledged Madame de Villette as his wife, which everybody knew she had been for some time, though not a year before she had solemnly forsworn her being so in a court of judicature, in order to draw a sum of money out of the hands of a banker [11] who pretended (very likely only for the advantage of

[11] Sir Matthew Decker. Bolingbroke writes to Wyndham in explanation of this affair, 22nd May, 1724, "Madame de Villette will appear [in *that* name or as *Lady Bolingbroke*] as she finds it necessary on account of her money, which John Drummond put and kept unjustifiably in that rascal Decker's hands. If it is not yet paid, she is only *Madame de Villette*, and has nothing to do with my affairs; for surely *any dissimulation is allowable* to get out of the hands of robbers and assassins."—*Coxe*, ii. 331. Sir Matthew Decker had a great reputation for probity and piety, and may have acted *bonâ fide*, for it seems next to certain that the money was originally Bolingbroke's own, and, at all events, would have become, by the marriage, legally his.

fingering the money a little longer) that without a decree in Chancery he could not be secure in delivering it. The banker said, if she was Lord Bolingbroke's wife, as was currently reported and by everybody believed, her money was his; and as his was forfeited by his attainder to the Government, consequently any banker in whose hands it was lodged would, notwithstanding the repayment to his wife, be accountable to the Government for it.

This chicane of the banker's put her ladyship under the disagreeable difficulty of either risking her 52,000*l.* (for the sum was no less), or denying that upon oath, which in a few months would be owned, and was already known, to all the world; however, her conscience and her interest had no long struggle; she forswore her marriage and received her money. The pious Duchess of Kendal pretended to be extremely shocked at this conduct; but the sore it made carried its own cure along with it; for the money Lady Bolingbroke was by this means enabled to give to Lady Walsingham, and the influence Lady Walsingham (whose conscience was less delicate) had over her aunt, soon set matters to right, so that Lady Bolingbroke had again access to the Duchess, and by the force of a great deal of insinuation and dexterity (for nobody ever had more) she took such fast hold of this old, simple, easy, honest woman, and her avaricious fury of a niece, that Lord Bolingbroke got what he pleased suggested by his wife to the Duchess, and by the Duchess to the King. He did not fail to make use of this canal to convey all the bad impressions he could of Sir Robert Walpole; and he had so far gained her Grace, that he prevailed with her

to deliver a letter to the King that contained a compendium of every accusation laid before or after in that weekly philippic the 'Craftsman Journal;' and this at the very time when he was constantly telling Sir Robert that the very air he breathed was the gift of his bounty, and that without his assistance he must have passed his whole life in proscription, poverty, and exile. The letter concluded with a petition to the King to see him at the Duchess of Kendal's lodgings, a promise to prove in detail all he had advanced in the letter, and a desire, if he did not convince his Majesty in that audience that Sir Robert was the weakest minister any prince ever employed abroad, and the wickedest that ever had the direction of affairs at home, that the King would never hear nor see him any more. The first use the King made of this letter was to show it to Sir Robert, and ask him what answer he should give to it; Sir Robert advised him to see Lord Bolingbroke, and hear all he had to say, which the King absolutely refused; but as Sir Robert imagined, in case he should advise the King to stick to that refusal, or not press him to retract it, that his enemies would insinuate it was his fear of what Lord Bolingbroke had to say that made him contrive to shut the King's ear to his accuser, he prevailed with his Majesty to consent to this interview. Sir Robert, who was now in possession of the letter, found out that it was the Duchess of Kendal who had given it to the King, and as it was delivered open, he knew she must have been acquainted with the contents, and consequently could not have been much averse to its succeeding. It did so far succeed that the King saw Lord Bolingbroke—but for the last time, and his Majesty

told Sir Robert everything that passed at this interview.

After his lordship had in a very long, florid exordium set forth his own merit, knowledge, and abilities, and entered into general accusations and invectives against Sir Robert, the King asked him what particular charge he could advance and prove, to make good these general assertions; for that much more was requisite than what he had yet heard, to weaken his favour or alter his opinion of a minister whose services he had already found so beneficial to him, in whose counsels he had so much confidence, and of whose judgment he had experienced so many proofs. To this Lord Bolingbroke made no other reply than recapitulating the same invectives in different words, telling the King how odious Sir Robert was to the people in general, how insolent to particulars; how ignorant he was thought in the foreign, how corrupt in the domestic; and, in short, that he was so despised abroad and hated at home, that, if continued in power, he would bring his Majesty's negotiations into irretrievable difficulties, and make the King at last as unpopular in this country as himself. To which the King made no other answer than coolly asking him whether that was all he had to say, and then dismissed him.[12]

But Sir Robert, notwithstanding this material instance of the strength of his interest in the closet, could not but be much alarmed to find that below stairs[13] he

[12] I relate this whole story just as it was told to me by Sir Robert Walpole himself.—*Lord Hervey.* It is told in the 'Reminiscences' more succinctly, and with some not important variations in the details.

[13] The King's closet was on the first floor of the palace of St. James's; the Duchess of Kendal's and Lady Walsingham's on the ground-floor, next the garden.

had two such formidable enemies, and Lord Bolingbroke two such powerful advocates, as the Duchess and her niece. He consulted with Lord Townshend what was to be done; he found Lady Bolingbroke had constant access to the Duchess, knew she had credit there, and very reasonably, of course, feared that what had made no impression at first might, by repeated applications, come to have its effect at last. His jealousies and suspicions increased so much that, just before the last time the King set out for Hanover, he told the King what he apprehended from the Duchess's favour to Lord Bolingbroke and interest with his Majesty. And as it had been very sanguinely insinuated by Lord Bolingbroke to his friends, and buzzed about in whispers even at Court, that his Majesty was at last prevailed upon to discard him, and that the stroke already resolved upon was to be struck when he was at Hanover, he begged only to know from his Majesty what foundation there was for such suggestions; and if he was come to any resolution of that sort, that he would be so kind as to execute it before his departure. The King assured him he had no such intentions, and went so far as to say he took it ill of Sir Robert that he could believe him so weak as to be wrought upon by any persuasion or interest whatever to change a servant he loved and valued, for a knave whose conduct, character, and principles he had always abhorred.[14]

Thus stood Sir Robert Walpole's credit and Lord Bolingbroke's hopes at Court when the late King went

---

[14] This corroborates directly what Horace Walpole only inferred from circumstances.—*Reminiscences.*

last over. As to Lord Bolingbroke's general character, it was so mixed that he had certainly some qualifications that the greatest men might be proud of, and many which the worst would be ashamed of: he had fine talents, a natural eloquence, great quickness, a happy memory, and very extensive knowledge: but he was vain, much beyond the general run of mankind, timid, false, injudicious, and ungrateful; elate and insolent in power, dejected and servile in disgrace: few people ever believed him without being deceived, or trusted him without being betrayed: he was one to whom prosperity was no advantage, and adversity no instruction: he had brought his affairs to that pass that he was almost as much distressed in his private fortune as desperate in his political views, and was upon such a foot in the world that no king would employ him, no party support him, and few particulars defend him; his enmity was the contempt of those he attacked, and his friendship a weight and reproach to those he adhered to. Those who were most partial to him could not but allow that he was ambitious without fortitude, and enterprising without resolution; that he was fawning without insinuation, and insincere without art; that he had admirers without friendship, and followers without attachment; parts without probity, knowledge without conduct, and experience without judgment. This was certainly his character and situation; but since it is the opinion of the wise, the speculative, and the learned, that most men are born with the same propensities, actuated by the same passions, and conducted by the same original principles, and differing only in the manner of pursuing the same ends, I shall not so far chime

in with the bulk of Lord Bolingbroke's contemporaries as to pronounce he had more failings than any man ever had; but it is impossible to see all that is written, and hear all that is said of him, and not allow that if he had not a worse heart than the rest of mankind, at least he must have had much worse luck.

It will not be necessary to say much on the character of Sir Robert Walpole; the following work will demonstrate his abilities in business and his dexterity in Courts and Parliaments to have been much superior to his contemporaries. He had a strength of parts equal to any advancement, a spirit to struggle with any difficulties, a steadiness of temper immoveable by any disappointments. He had great skill in figures, the nature of the funds, and the revenue; his first application was to this branch of knowledge; but as he afterwards rose to the highest posts of power, and continued longer there than any first minister in this country since Lord Burleigh ever did, he grew, of course, conversant with all the other parts of government, and very soon equally able in transacting them: the weight of the whole administration lay on him; every project was of his forming, conducting, and executing: from the time of making the Treaty of Hanover, all the foreign as well as domestic affairs passed through his hands: and, considering the little assistance he received from subalterns, it is incredible what a variety and quantity of business he dispatched; but as he had infinite application and long experience, so he had great method and a prodigious memory, with a mind and spirit that were indefatigable: and without every one of these natural as well as acquired advantages, it would in-

deed have been impossible for him to go through half what he undertook.

No man ever was blessed with a clearer head, a truer or quicker judgment, or a deeper insight into mankind; he knew the strength and weakness of everybody he had to deal with, and how to make his advantage of both. He had more warmth of affection and friendship for some particular people than one could have believed it possible for any one who had been so long raking in the dirt of mankind to be capable of feeling for so worthless a species of animals. One should naturally have imagined that the contempt and distrust he must have had for the species in gross, would have given him at least an indifference and distrust towards every particular. Whether his negligence of his enemies, and never stretching his power to gratify his resentment of the sharpest injury, was policy or constitution, I shall not determine: but I do not believe anybody who knows these times will deny that no minister ever was more outraged, or less apparently revengeful. Some of his friends, who were not unforgiving themselves, nor very apt to see imaginary faults in him, have condemned this easiness in his temper as a weakness that has often exposed him to new injuries, and given encouragement to his adversaries to insult him with impunity. Brigadier Churchill,[15] a worthy and good-natured, friendly and honourable man, who had lived Sir Robert's intimate friend for many years, and through all the different stages of his power and

[15] Charles Churchill, a natural son of a brother of the great Duke of Marlborough, Colonel 1707—Major-General 1735. *His* natural son by Mrs. Oldfield married Sir Robert Walpole's natural daughter by Miss Skerritt, to whom, on her father's peerage in 1742, was scandalously given the rank of an Earl's daughter.

retirement, prosperity and disgrace, has often said that Sir Robert Walpole was so little able to resist the show of repentance in those from whom he had received the worst usage, that a few tears and promises of amendment have often washed out the stains even of ingratitude.

In all occurrences, and at all times, and in all difficulties, he was constantly present and cheerful; he had very little of what is generally called insinuation, and with which people are apt to be taken for the present, without being gained; but no man ever knew better among those he had to deal with who was to be had, on what terms, by what methods, and how the acquisition would answer. He was not one of those projecting systematical great geniuses who are always thinking in theory, and are above common practice: he had been too long conversant in business not to know that in the fluctuation of human affairs and variety of accidents to which the best concerted schemes are liable, they must often be disappointed who build on the certainty of the most probable events; and therefore seldom turned his thoughts to the provisional warding off future evils which might or might not happen; or the scheming of remote advantages, subject to so many intervening crosses; but always applied himself to the present occurrence, studying and generally hitting upon the properest method to improve what was favourable, and the best expedient to extricate himself out of what was difficult. There never was any minister to whom access was so easy and so frequent, nor whose answers were more explicit. He knew how to oblige when he bestowed, and not to shock when he denied; to govern

without oppressing, and conquer without triumph. He pursued his ambition without curbing his pleasures, and his pleasures without neglecting his business; he did the latter with ease, and indulged himself in the other without giving scandal or offence.[16] In private life, and to all who had any dependence upon him, he was kind and indulgent; he was generous without ostentation, and an economist without penuriousness; not insolent in success, nor irresolute in distress; faithful to his friends, and not inveterate to his foes.

Sir William Wyndham,[17] who was at the head of those who called themselves Hanover Tories at the death of

---

[16] This is not exact. It gave great scandal, and excited both ridicule and reproach. The rest of the character is just enough. Pope, to whom he had granted a private favour, has immortalized his good humour and good nature:—

"Seen him I have, but in his happier hour
Of social pleasure ill-exchanged for power—
Seen him, incumbent with the venal tribe,
Smile without art, and win without a bribe."

And Lady Mary Wortley Montagu wrote the following lines on his portrait:—

"These were the lively eyes and rosy hue
Of Robin's face when Robin first I knew;
The gay companion and the favourite guest,
Loved without awe, and without views caress'd.
His cheerful smile and honest open look
Added new graces to the truths he spoke.
Then every man found something to commend,
The pleasant neighbour and the worthy friend;
The generous master of a private house,
The tender father and indulgent spouse.
The hardest censors, at the worst, believed
His temper was too easily deceived:
A consequential ill good-nature draws;
A bad effect, but from a noble cause!"

[17] I do not find the exact date of Wyndham's birth; but as he was first married in July, 1708, and was brought forward in office 1711, "*at a very early age*," he was probably born about 1685. He died in 1740, before the triumph of his party over Walpole.

the late King, was first brought into the political world by Lord Bolingbroke in the latter end of Queen Anne's reign, and, of course, began the world, if not an avowed Jacobite, at least a Jacobite very little disguised. He was a man of family, fortune, and figure, but pushed up to the employment of Chancellor of the Exchequer by the favour of Lord Bolingbroke, at a time when neither his years, his experience, his talents, his knowledge, nor his weight could give him any pretence to the distinction of so great a post. But though the *éclat* of this advancement might flatter his ambition at first, yet the gratitude which he showed to his benefactor by linking his fortune with his became a clog to that ambition ever after, and made the friendship that first raised him above his desert keep him afterwards down as much below it. In the beginning of the late reign nobody doubted his being one of the chief promoters of that disaffection and those commotions in the West which ended in an open rebellion: his conduct at that time is not to be justified; to raise a spirit of Jacobitism and sedition in a parcel of unhappy wretches who were led by his judgment and trusted to his protection, and to leave them at that very crisis when the spirit he had fomented brought them to action, was a conduct for which his best friends must think his timidity the best excuse. However, his not appearing now in open rebellion did not prevent the Government, as they were informed of his previous clandestine steps, from sending a messenger to apprehend him; he was seized at his own house, Witham, in Somersetshire, but made his escape out of the messenger's hands upon having leave given him to bid his wife adieu in the

next room, and giving his honour to Colonel Hurst, as the messenger affirms and he denies, to return immediately and surrender himself into custody. He fled in a clergyman's habit; but, at the instigation of his father-in-law, the Duke of Somerset, in a little time surrendered himself to the Government, was kept prisoner some months in the Tower, then admitted to bail, but never brought to a trial. Just before Lord Bolingbroke returned from France it was thought he was capitulating with the administration; but his attachment to his old friend and patron, the influence that friend had over him, and the irreconcilable enmity Lord Bolingbroke bore to Sir Robert Walpole, utterly put an end to those dealings, if ever there were such on foot; his behaviour at the time of the rebellion, and his taking all opportunities afterwards to declare himself a strong Hanoverian, made the Jacobites not love him, though they did not care to separate from him.

He was far from having first-rate parts,[18] but by a gentleman-like general behaviour and constant attendance in the House of Commons, a close application to the business of it, and frequent speaking, he had got a sort of Parliamentary routine, and without being a bright speaker was a popular one, well heard, and useful to his party. Lord Bolingbroke's closet was the school to which he owed all his knowledge of foreign affairs, and where he made himself master of many facts that got him attention and gave him reputation in Parliament,

[18] Speaker Onslow, influenced probably by Wyndham's weight in the House, gives a much higher estimate of his parts:—"He was in my opinion most made for a great man of any one that I have known in this age, —every thing about him seemed great," &c.—*Coxe*, 562.

though they were not introduced with that art, expressed with that energy, nor set off with that eloquence that would have attended them could his schoolmaster have delivered them there without a proxy.

When Mr. Pulteney and Sir William Wyndham were at the head of the opposition to the Court, Sir William's antagonists contributed much more than his friends to the advancement of his reputation; for as there was a secret rivalry and jealousy between these two Consuls of the Patriots (for so they were pleased to christen their faction), and that pique Sir Robert Walpole had to Mr. Pulteney was infinitely greater than any enmity he bore to the other—so all Sir Robert Walpole's people, to flatter him and mortify Mr. Pulteney, took every opportunity to compliment Sir William Wyndham in public assemblies, and give him the preference to his colleague whenever they were compared in private companies; though it was impossible for any impartial body to think that Mr. Pulteney was not as much Sir William Wyndham's superior in parts, knowledge, eloquence, and every other qualification but temper requisite to make a formidable enemy or a useful friend, as he was in fortune, in writing, and even in reputation, notwithstanding the partiality of their own party and the affectation of the other exerted itself so evidently to brighten the character of the one and obscure the fame of the other. The public was on this occasion, as on most others, much juster than any of the particulars that compose it, and decided so much in favour of Mr. Pulteney, that as his name at home was mentioned in conversation, in print, at Court, and by the populace twenty times for once that the other was

ever thought of, so in foreign courts it was as familiarly known as in that of England itself, where the other was never heard of.

This was the state of party and faction in England, and these their leaders, at the time of the accession of King George II. to the crown.

CHAPTER II.

Accession of George II.—Sir Spencer Compton designated as First Minister—His incapacity and blunders—Aspect of the Court—Walpole supported by the Queen, and continued in office—Hervey's attachment to Walpole—Civil List and Queen's Jointure Settled—Few official changes—Sir William Yonge—Lord Berkeley—Lord Torrington—the Battle of Cape Passaro—Motives of the King's adoption of Walpole—Mrs. Howard—Mary Bellenden—Superior influence of the Queen.

THE late King died on the road to Hanover, on the 11th of June, 1727, at Osnaburg, in the very same room where he was born. On Wednesday, June 14, news was brought by an express to Sir Robert Walpole, who was at dinner at Chelsea[1] when it arrived; he went immediately to Richmond (where the Prince of Wales then was) to acquaint him with what had happened, and receive his orders. The Prince was laid to

[1] Where Sir Robert Walpole had a villa. "On the death of King George I.," says Horace Walpole, "my father *killed two horses* in carrying the tidings to his successor; and kneeling down asked 'who should compose his Majesty's speech?' [to the council]. The King told him to go to Sir Spencer Compton. That gentleman, *unused to public business*, was forced to send for Sir Robert to help him in the composition. The Queen upon this asked the King if he had not better employ his father's minister, who could manage his business without the help of another. My father was *instantly* appointed."—*Walpoliana*, § 104. I suspect that in this case (as in some others) Horace Walpole has not been quite accurately reported by the editor of *Walpoliana*. It seems hardly credible that Sir Robert should have killed two horses between Chelsea and Richmond; nor, as we shall see presently, were the other steps of the affair so rapid as thus stated. Nor do I think that Horace Walpole could have represented Compton as *unused to public business:* he was now turned of fifty; he had been all his political life in office, had succeeded Walpole himself as *Paymaster*, and had been Speaker in three Parliaments. It was, therefore, not the habits of business that he wanted, but sagacity and talents. He was a younger son of the third Earl of Northampton.

sleep (as his custom had been for many years after dinner), and the Princess was in the bed-chamber with him, when the Duchess of Dorset, the lady-in-waiting, went in to let them know Sir Robert Walpole was there, who was immediately brought in; all he said was, "I am come to acquaint your Majesty with the death of your father." The King seemed extremely surprised, but not enough to forget his resentment to Sir Robert one moment; neither his confusion nor his joy at this great change, nor the benevolence so naturally felt by almost everybody towards the messenger of such good news, softened his voice or his countenance in one word or look. Whatever questions Sir Robert asked him with regard to the council being summoned, his being proclaimed, or other things necessary immediately to be provided, the King gave him no other answer than "Go to Chiswick and take your directions from Sir Spencer Compton."

This interview therefore was very short; Sir Robert went as commanded to Chiswick, and the King and Queen immediately to London.

As Sir Robert Walpole had not the least hope of making his peace so far as to be employed in the new reign, he did not endeavour to disguise to Sir Spencer Compton any one circumstance that had passed at Richmond, but naturally and openly told him:—

"The King, Sir, has sent me to you in such a manner as declares he intends you for his minister, and has commanded me to receive all my instructions from your mouth. It is what I as well as the rest of the world expected would be whenever this accident happened. You have been the Prince's Treasurer ever

since he came to England; it is a natural promotion to continue you upon his being King; your services entitle you to that mark of his favour, and your abilities and experience in business will both enable you to support the employment and justify him in bestowing it. Everything is in your hands; I neither could shake your power if I would, nor would I if I could. My time has been, yours is beginning; but as we all must depend in some degree upon our successors, and that it is always prudent for these successors by way of example to have some regard for their predecessors, that with the measure they mete it may be measured to them again—for this reason I put myself under your protection, and for this reason I expect you will give it. I desire no share of power or business; one of your white sticks,[2] or any employment of that sort, is all I ask as a mark from the crown that I am not abandoned to the enmity of those whose envy is the only source of their hate, and who consequently will wish you no better than they have done me the moment you are vested with those honours and that authority, the possession of which they will always covet, and the possessor of which, of course, they will always hate."

Sir Spencer Compton was at this time Speaker of the House of Commons, Treasurer to the Prince, and Paymaster to the army; he was a plodding, heavy fellow, with great application, but no talents, and vast complaisance for a Court without any address; he was always more concerned for the manner and form in

[2] Household officers—Chamberlain, Vice-Chamberlain, Steward, Treasurer, Cofferer, &c.—distinguished by carrying a white wand.

which a thing was to be done than about the propriety or expediency of the thing itself; and as he was calculated to execute rather than to project, for a subaltern rather than a commander, so he was much fitter for a clerk to a minister than for a minister to a Prince; whatever was resolved upon, he would often know how properly to perform, but seldom how to advise what was proper to be resolved upon. His only pleasures were money and eating; his only knowledge forms and precedents; and his only insinuation bows and smiles.

But as he did not want pride or ambition, though he wanted parts to feed them, he was extremely pleased with this speech of Sir Robert Walpole's, and looking upon himself, dazzled with the lustre of so bright a prospect, as possessed already of all the favour and power of this new Court, he promised Sir Robert Walpole his protection; and asked in return the assistance of Sir Robert's experience to enlighten him on the present state of affairs, and to instruct him in the future conduct of them.

They went together forthwith to London, and first to the Duke of Devonshire's,[3] who was then President of the Council, but laid up with the gout and not able to attend there. The Duke of Devonshire was a man who had no uncommon portion of understanding; and as his chief skill lay in painting, medals, and horses, he was more able as a *virtuoso* than a statesman, and a much better jockey than he was a politician. He had a fair character, the dignity of a man of quality,

[3] William, second Duke—born about 1674—died in 1729.

and was justly more considered than most people of the same great rank and fortune (who, perhaps, had better abilities), from having been always steady to his party and constant to his friends.

There was nobody present at this meeting but these two knights, the master of the house, my Lord Chancellor King, Lord Trevor, keeper of the Privy Seal, and Sir Paul Methuen, and all that was concerted there was the common forms that were to be observed in the meeting of the Council.

Whilst these things were regulating, Sir Spencer Compton took Sir Robert Walpole aside and desired him, as a speech would be necessary on the occasion to be made in council by the King, and as Sir Robert was so much more accustomed to this sort of compositions than himself, that he would be so good to go into another room and make forthwith a draught of what would be proper for the King to say, whilst he went to Leicester Fields to receive His Majesty's commands.

Sir Robert at first seemed to decline this office, but Sir Spencer Compton insisting upon it as a favour to him, Sir Robert Walpole, who was the last man in England he ought to have employed on this occasion, undertook at his request that which, if Sir Spencer Compton had had common sense or foresight, he would have known the better it was done the worse it would be for himself.

That which made this step yet more absurd was, that if this precedent-monger had only turned to the old Gazettes published at the beginning of the former reigns, he might have copied full as good a declaration

from these records as any Sir Robert Walpole could give him.

Sir Robert, retiring into a room by himself, went immediately to work, and Sir Spencer Compton to Leicester Fields, where the King and Queen were already arrived, and receiving the compliments of every man of all degrees and all parties in the town; the square was thronged with multitudes of the meaner sort and resounded with huzzas and acclamations, whilst every room in the house was filled with people of higher rank, crowding to kiss their hands and to make the earliest and warmest professions of zeal for their service; but the common face of a Court at this time was quite reversed, for as there was not a creature in office, excepting those who were his servants as Prince, who had not the most sorrowful and dejected countenance of distress and disappointment, so there was not one out of employment who did not already exult with all the insolence of the most absolute power and settled prosperity.

As soon as Sir Spencer Compton had been with the King in his closet, he returned to his coach through a lane of *bowers* in the ante-chambers and on the stairs, who were all shouldering one another to pay adoration to this new idol, and knocking their heads together to whisper compliments and petitions as he passed.

At his return to Devonshire House he found the declaration for the King already drawn; he approved it, desired Sir Robert's leave to copy it, and begged that he would not, even to the people in the next room, say anything of his having done it: it was first read to the company at Devonshire House, approved of there

without any objections, and then carried by Sir Spencer Compton in his own hand-writing to the King. Sir Robert followed to Leicester Fields, where he found Sir Spencer Compton a good deal embarrassed by the King's desiring him to alter one passage in the declaration, which Sir Spencer wished should stand, and which if he had not he did not know how to go about to change. He desired Sir Robert to go into the King and persuade him to leave it as it was originally drawn, which office Sir Robert readily accepted, and was thanked by Sir Spencer for the success he ought to have apprehended.[4]

The council met, and the King's declaration there was as follows:—

"At the Court at Leicester House,
"14th June, 1727.

"The sudden and unexpected death of the King, my dearest father, has filled my heart with so much concern and surprise that I am at a loss how to express myself upon this great and melancholy occasion.

"I am sensible of the weight that immediately falls upon me by taking the government of a nation so powerful at home and of such influence and consequence abroad, but my love and affection to this country, from my knowledge and experience of you, makes me resolve cheerfully to undergo all difficulties for the sake and good of my people.

"The religion, laws, and liberties of the kingdom are most dear to me, and the preservation of the constitution in Church and State as it is now happily established, shall be my first and always my chief care.

"And as the alliances entered into by the late King, my

4 This was the opportunity for the Queen's recommendation of Walpole: "She, a better judge than her husband of the capacities of the two men, and who had silently watched for a proper moment for overturning the new designations, did not lose a moment in observing to the King how prejudicial it would be to his affairs to prefer a man in whose own judgment his predecessor was the fittest person to execute the office."—*Reminiscences.*

father, with foreign powers have contributed to the restoring the tranquillity and preserving the balance of Europe, I shall endeavour to cultivate those alliances, and to improve and perfect this great work for the honour, interest, and security of my people."

The King stayed four days in town, during which period Leicester House, which used to be a desert, was thronged from morning to night, like the 'Change at noon. But Sir Robert Walpole walked through these rooms as if they had been still empty; his presence, that used to make a crowd wherever he appeared, now emptied every corner he turned to, and the same people who were officiously a week ago clearing the way to flatter his prosperity, were now getting out of it to avoid sharing his disgrace.[5] Everybody looked upon it as sure, and whatever professions of adherence and gratitude for former favours were made him in private, there were none among the many his power had obliged (excepting General Churchill and Lord Hervey) who did not in public as notoriously decline and fear his notice as they used industriously to seek and covet it. These two men constantly attended him, and never paid so much as the compliment of a visit to Sir Spencer Compton, who had already opened a levée and received the solicitations of the whole world as the only channel to the King's ear. Among these herds was Mr. Dodington, one of the Lords of the

[5] "My mother (says Horace Walpole), Sir Spencer's designation, and not its evaporation, being known, could not make her way [to pay her respects to the King and Queen] between the scornful backs and elbows of her late devotees, nor could approach nearer to the Queen than the third or fourth row; but no sooner was she descried by her Majesty, than the Queen cried aloud, *There I am sure I see a friend!* The torrent divided and shrunk to either side; 'and as I came away,' said my mother, 'I might have walked over their heads if I had pleased.' "—*Reminiscences.*

Treasury, whose early application and distinguished assiduity at this juncture to the supposed successor of his former patron and benefactor was never forgiven.[6]

Sir Robert Walpole, his brother, Mr. Horace Walpole, Ambassador to France, the Duke of Newcastle, and Lord Townshend, the two Secretaries of State, who were, properly speaking, the whole old administration at the death of the late King, expected themselves and were expected by the whole world hourly to be displaced.

The first of these the present King had, in the latter years of his father's reign, called *rogue* and *rascal*, without much reserve, to several people, upon several occasions; to Horace Walpole he had as liberally and as publicly dispensed the appellations of scoundrel and fool; and for the Duke of Newcastle, the King, when Prince, had been so personally disobliged[7] by him, that

[6] This baseness of Dodington—a sample of his whole life—was the more remarkable, because he had addressed a panegyrical epistle to Sir Robert, in which he had promised—in a couplet sneered at by Pope—a very different conduct. "I," he said,

"To share thy *adverse* fate alone pretend;
In power a servant, out of power a friend."

[7] This was a branch, and indeed the acme, of the quarrel between George I. and his son. "The Prince had intended his uncle, the Duke of York, to be godfather, with the King, to his second son, William, Duke of Cumberland, born 15th April, 1721. Nothing could equal the Prince's indignation when the King named the Duke of Newcastle for the second sponsor, and would hear of no other. The christening took place, as usual, in the Princess's bedchamber. No sooner had the bishop closed the ceremony, than the Prince, crossing the foot of the bed, stepped up to the Duke of Newcastle, and holding up his hand and forefinger in a menacing attitude, said, '*You are a rascal*, but I shall find you;' meaning, in broken English, 'I shall find a time to be revenged.' The King was so provoked at this outrage in his presence, that he pretended to understand it as a challenge, and the Prince was actually put under arrest. The arrest was soon taken off; but at night the Prince and Princess were ordered to leave St. James's Palace, and retired to the house of his chamberlain, the Earl of Grantham, in Albemarle Street."—*Reminiscences.*

he had sworn a thousand times he never would forgive him; and, joined to this resentment of the particular injuries he thought he had received from him, he had, as to his public character, his parliamentary abilities and knowledge in business, the same just contempt which most other people had contracted for his Grace, either by their own observation or the deference they paid to the opinion of the public. For Lord Townshend, the King looked upon him as no more an honest man than as an able minister; and attributed to the warmth of his temper and his scanty genius, the strength of his passions and weakness of his understanding, all the present intricacy, uncertainty, and confusion in the affairs of Europe.

The whole world knowing this to be His Majesty's opinion of these four governors of this kingdom, that, as I have just related, he used always to speak of the first as a great rogue; of the second, as a dirty buffoon;[8] of the third, as an impertinent fool; and of the fourth, as a choleric blockhead; it was very natural to expect the reins of power would not long be left in their hands: and when Lord Malpas,[9] son-in-law to Sir Robert Walpole, was turned out of the Mastership of the Robes, and not in the softest manner, the day after the King came to the crown—it was concluded he led a dance which the rest were soon to follow.

If it had not been for the stupidity of Sir Spencer Compton, who did not know his own strength, or what

[8] The same terms that his nephew Horace often applies to him. He was created Lord Walpole, and was the ancestor of the present house of Orford.

[9] George, third Lord Cholmondeley, married Sir Robert's only legitimate daughter: their issue are Sir Robert's heirs, and inherit Houghton.

use to make of it, they had all—but certainly at least Sir Robert Walpole—been displaced the very day after the King came to the crown; but as this awkward statesman was either blind to his own interest or ignorant of his own power, he suffered that opportunity to slip through his hands, which, if he had had skill to improve, or resolution to seize, he might indisputably have been what he was equally ambitious of and unfit for.

But as the King was not pressed to the taking of this step, and that his Civil List (which was at present the chief object in his view) was in less than a fortnight to be settled in Parliament, he very naturally deferred any change in the administration till that great and favourite point was determined; and that it might be adjusted to his satisfaction with the unanimous concurrence of all parties, he very prudently chose not to make the one desperate, though he gave the others hopes; and kept the interest of every other body in suspense, that his own might be pursued without opposition: though perhaps, like many other refining historians, I attribute that to prudence which was only owing to accident—two things often mistaken one for the other. But whether it was the effect of policy or the natural consequence of the present juncture of the affairs, whatever was the cause of his conduct, this was certainly the effect—that his postponing thus the gratification of his resentment facilitated the success of his own affairs in Parliament, gave him time to cool, the Queen time to think, and Sir Robert time to work.

One other very material reason which might induce the King to suspend the change of his ministry I must not omit here to relate. Mr. Walpole, who (as I be-

fore observed) was ambassador in France at the demise of the late King, immediately upon his receiving the news of the King's death went to Versailles, to the Cardinal de Fleury, then first minister, and got him to write a letter to our new King, full of assurances of the inviolable fidelity with which he was determined to adhere to all treaties and engagements entered into with his father, provided the King on his part was inclined to act on the same plan, and to pursue the same measures, that his father had done; and as the interest both of France and England at this important critical juncture depended on the harmony and good understanding which he wished to preserve between the two kingdoms, he hoped His Majesty would not give the other powers of Europe such an advantage over them as to weaken that union which might give laws to the rest of the world whilst it subsisted, but must expose the two kingdoms to receive laws from others whenever it was broken.

With this letter Mr. Walpole arrived in England the Sunday after the news came of the King's death [*June* 18*th*]; and though his coming was not the only thing that turned the scale in favour of the old ministry, yet it certainly threw in a considerable weight whilst it was in balance.

On the 19th the Court removed to Kensington, where the King, by the audiences that were asked and the offers that were made to him by the great men of all denominations, found himself set up at auction, and every one bidding for his favour at the expense of the public.

The greatest offer, and the most infamous for the

bidder, was made by that affected patriot Mr. Pulteney, who proposed to the King the same 800,000*l.* per year for his Civil List which was afterwards given, with the additional advantage—which was not given—of taking off that tax of sixpence in the pound on all Civil List salaries and pensions, and charging the Sinking Fund, in lieu of the Civil List establishment, with that 30,000*l.* a year.[10]

The saddling the Sinking Fund with this tax would certainly have been detrimental to the nation, as it must of course have protracted its debts by lessening the sum appropriated for the payment of them; nor was it very politicly calculated even for the purpose it was designed for. As it would only have increased a little the salaries of the King's servants, without being any gain to the King himself, His Majesty, whose avarice he sought to tickle and allure by this proposal, was not likely to be much obliged by it.

And now the great stroke of displacing Sir Robert Walpole being so long suspended, his enemies began to fear, and his friends to hope, that this protracted reprieve might at last turn into an absolute pardon. Whilst it hung in this equilibrium Sir Robert Walpole received the following letter from an unknown hand:—

"I am one of the many you have obliged,[11] and one of the few that will never forget it. My gratitude for these obligations, and the desire I have to do you service, is the sole

[10] Here seems some mistake: 6*d.* in the pound on *the whole* Civil List would have been but 20,000*l.* a year; and as it was payable only on salaries, pensions, &c., it would have been proportionably less.

[11] It appears subsequently that Lord Hervey had a *pension* of 1000*l.*—but would have preferred *office*, and was, I think, disappointed and vexed at not being included in Sir Robert's official arrangements. He soon after went to Italy, where he remained for a year and a-half.

occasion of this letter; nor have I so mean an opinion of your understanding, or so good a one of my own, as to imagine that, at this very important crisis, you can want my advice how to act. But though you are too skilful to want counsel, yet the most skilful may want intelligence: and there are certainly schemes on foot to impose upon you. The new King's sole thought and care at present is the establishment of his Civil List, which he is advised (and perhaps by your chief antagonist) to commit to your care. He is told that your apprehensions are such that at this juncture you dare refuse him nothing; that some hopes thrown in, and a show of favour, will bind you still faster to his interest; in short, the Queen speaks to you through his mouth: but this point once settled, you are to be dropt; neither would you be allowed this share in the administration, but that in case their demands should be thought exorbitant, you may incur all the odium with the people, though you are to be deprived of all the merit towards the King. Others are to have the advantage of disposing of this money, though you are to undergo all the unpopular difficulty of providing it. You are to plough the field, and others are to reap and distribute the harvest. It is already given out that you are bidding with the public money to buy your peace with the King: in a word, Lord Sunderland's policy in 1720 is revived:[12] may it have the same fate; and end as much to your advantage as it is designed for your ruin. I have no notion but, where you have access, you must have credit, and that your being esteemed must always be the consequence of your being heard. The things I have here told you, came to my knowledge merely by accident, and the babbling indiscretion of a fool who wishes you ill. Your enemies undoubtedly take this to be your present situation at court; whether well founded in their opinion or not, I know not. All happiness, success, and prosperity attend you. If this letter

---

[12] This alludes to Walpole's having been employed by Sunderland's ministry in 1720 to extricate the finances of the country from the difficulties created by the South Sea bubble. It seems from this hint that Sunderland had hoped that Walpole's popularity might be damaged by that commission.

proves of any use to you, I shall be glad; if it is of none, I shall not be ashamed, because you will never know from whence it comes. And I am sure I mean it well."

This letter Sir Robert Walpole afterwards found out had been written by Lord Hervey. Sir Robert erased that passage where it said "The Queen speaks to you through the King's mouth," and then showed the letter to the Queen, to let her know what his friends thought and the world said of his present situation. The Queen assured him she believed no man so capable of serving the King as himself; that her interest, if she had any, should never be employed for any other body; that she was sure the King's intentions were to continue him; and that she thought the term of "policy" given in that letter to the scheme suggested to be at present the foundation of the King's seeming favour to Sir Robert Walpole, would be much too soft a word for so much deceit and treachery. When the King desired Sir Robert Walpole to fix the Civil List revenue in the way I shall presently relate, he took him by the hand, and among many other things that he said, intimating his designs to continue him in his service, he made use of this very strong expression: "*Consider, Sir Robert, what makes me easy in this matter will prove for your ease too; it is for my life it is to be fixed, and it is for your life.*"

On the 27th June the Parliament met, when the Civil List, unopposed by any body but Mr. Shippen,[13] the

[13] William Shippen, of *the Middle Temple*, was in Parliament (with one short interval) from 1707 to 1743. In 1717 he was sent to the Tower for saying that "*the second paragraph of the King's speech seemed rather calculated for the meridian of Germany than Great Britain. The King is a stranger to our language and constitution.*" In allusion to this *plain speaking*, Pope calls him "*Downright Shippen.*"

head of the veteran stanch Jacobites, was settled in the following manner:—The produce of those funds that had been tied down for the provision of 700,000*l.* a year on the late King, and 100,000*l.* more on the Prince of Wales, was now given entirely to the present King, without a deduction of 100,000*l.* to the present Prince of Wales, but leaving the provision for him to the discretion and generosity of his father,[14] and without giving the overplus of 800,000*l.* to the Sinking Fund, which was the use to which the surplus of these funds in the late reign was appropriated after the 700,000*l.* was paid: so that this King had the whole produce of these, which was then computed at an average to amount to 900,000*l.* a year; and if that computation had proved true, the Civil List of this King would have been, by 200,000*l.* a year, a greater revenue than any King of England was ever known to have before. The ridiculous reasons given for this exorbitant augmentation of it were, the expense of a wife and a great many children—as if no King of England before had ever been married, or to a pregnant wife; and the other sensible argument was, things being so much dearer than they used to be, and consequently housekeeping so much more expensive;—good excuses for a farmer's backwardness in paying his rent, but not things that could be much felt in the manner of living of a king: but

[14] The cause, or at least a reasonable excuse, of this difference, may have been that George II. came over at his father's accession, at the age of thirty-one, with his wife and daughters, and necessarily required a separate establishment. Prince Frederic, on the contrary, was at his father's accession about twenty, a bachelor, had not yet come to England—and, in fact, did not arrive for near a year and a-half later, when he was created Prince of Wales.

unreasonable as it was thought to settle the Civil List in this extravagant manner, yet the bill passed the House of Commons without one negative but Mr. Shippen's. No one thought it reasonable, yet no one opposed it; no one wished for it, and no one voted against it: and I believe it is the single instance that can be given, of a question carried there, without two opponents or well-wishers.

At the same time the Queen's jointure was settled; for the provision of which, in this fit of generosity, these frugal dispensers of the people's money were pleased to bestow upon her, besides Somerset-House and Richmond-Lodge, 100,000*l.* a year, which was just double what any Queen of England had ever had before; to such a pitch of extravagance did these contending parliamentary bidders raise the price of Court favour at this royal auction.[15]

When these two great and laudable works were perfected, the old Parliament was to be dissolved and a new one chosen. It was at their dismission, that the decisive stroke was struck in the contention for power between Sir Robert Walpole and Sir Spencer Compton: the King had ordered them both to make him a speech, and when he came to choose, shook his head at poor Sir Spencer's, and approved of Sir Robert's.

The only two things that were done during this short interregnum of Sir Robert Walpole's, contrary to his inclination, were, first, the displacing of his son-in-law, Lord Malpas, which I have already mentioned; and, secondly, the turning a Sir William Yonge, a known creature of his, out of the Commission of Treasury.

[15] The *Jointure* vote passed *nem. con.*, and so did the Civil List *Bill*.

The King used always to call him "Stinking Yonge," and had conceived and expressed such an insurmountable dislike to his person and character, that no interest nor influence was potent enough at this time to prevail with His Majesty to continue him.

Sir William Yonge was certainly a very remarkable instance how much character and reputation depend sometimes on unaccountable accidents and the caprice of mankind; and an undeniable exception to what I think (some few cases excepted) a pretty general rule—that is, that however prejudiced some particulars may be for, and others against, such men in public stations and characters, yet the true merit of such men commonly finds and settles its own weight, as much as any commodity in a market; and is generally rated according to its real value in public opinion, as much as the other in public sale.

I acknowledge Sir William Yonge an exception to this maxim; for, without having done anything that I know of remarkably profligate—anything out of the common track of a ductile courtier and a parliamentary tool—his name was proverbially used to express everything pitiful, corrupt, and contemptible.[16] It is true he was a great liar, but rather a mean than a vicious one. He had been always constant to the same party; he was good-natured and good-humoured—never offensive in company; nobody's friend—nobody's enemy. He had no wit in private conversation; but

[16] Sir Robert Walpole used to say of him, that nothing but so bad a character could have kept down his talents, and nothing but his talents have kept up his character. Both Horace Walpole and Lord Hervey seem to have been strongly prejudiced against Yonge; and Pope makes many disparaging allusions to him.

was remarkably quick in taking hints to harangue upon in Parliament; he had a knack of words there that was surprising, considering how little use they were to him anywhere else. He had a great command of what is called parliamentary language, and a talent of talking eloquently without a meaning, and expatiating agreeably upon nothing, beyond any man, I believe, that ever had the gift of speech.

These advantages made him very useful to Sir Robert Walpole, who caressed him without loving him, and employed him without trusting him; but the *éclat* even of this great minister's favour could neither whiten Sir William Yonge's character nor keep him in employment: the one was, in my opinion, unreasonably run down, and the other unreasonably taken from him; for he had done nothing at all to deserve to forfeit the latter, and nothing more to deserve to lose the first, than what a thousand other people had done without losing either. However, Sir Robert advised him, upon this disgrace, to be patient, not clamorous—to submit, not resent or oppose—to be as subservient to the Court in attendance, and give the King his assistance as constantly and as assiduously in Parliament as if he was paid for it: telling him and all the world what afterwards proved true, that whatever people might imagine, Yonge was not sunk, he had only dived, and would yet get up again.[17]

This was the single alteration made after the dissolution of the Parliament, contrary to the will and

[17] He was re-appointed to the Treasury in 1730, and thence promoted to be Secretary-at-War in 1735, which he held till 1746. He was the father of Sir George Yonge, also Secretary-at-War in 1795. The father and son represented Honiton in thirteen successive parliaments.

representation of Sir Robert Walpole; and though this was a proof that he was forced to bend in one instance, yet every other change demonstrated his influence.

His son-in-law, Lord Malpas, was put into the Admiralty; his great rival and enemy, Mr. Pulteney, denied leave to stand candidate upon the interest of the Court for Westminster—never consulted in the closet, and always very coldly received in the Drawing-room; a whole race of Chetwynds,[18] Sir Robert Walpole's declared ill-wishers, were turned out in a lump; and, what was reckoned the strongest demonstration of his power, Lord Berkeley removed from the head of the Admiralty, and Lord Torrington appointed to succeed him. Lord Berkeley was the admiral who brought the late King over; born and educated a stanch Whig, and had never deviated a moment one step of his life from these principles. He had been of the late King's bedchamber, and at the head of the fleet during all the late reign. He was a man of great family and great quality, rough, proud, hard, and obstinate, with excellent good natural parts, but so uncultivated that he was totally ignorant of every branch of knowledge but his profession. He was haughty and tyrannical, but honourable, gallant, observant of his word; but equally incapable of flattering a prince, bending to a minister, or lying to anybody he had to deal with. Lord Torrington was more supple and more tractable; he had received the honour of peerage in the late reign as a

[18] Lord Chetwynd from the Rangership of St. James's Park—William Chetwynd from the Admiralty—John from the Board of Trade, &c. It appears by a complaining letter from Lady Chetwynd in the Suffolk Cor. (i. 151) that they had put their trust in Sir Spencer Compton and Mrs. Howard.

reward for an action, for which he ought to have lost his head—which was his attacking, without orders countersigned by a Secretary of State, the Spanish fleet in the Mediterranean, in favour of the Emperor, of whom our King wanted to buy, with Sicily, the investiture of Bremen and Verden; which, by the by, he was never able to obtain. Voltaire, in his 'History of Charles XII. of Sweden,' says, "Le Roi George n'avoit aucun but en toutes ses actions que la possession de ces deux places, sur lesquelles il n'avoit aucun droit, que de les avoit acheté à vil prix aux Danois, à qui elles n'appartenaient pas."

Lord Torrington, who knew the late King's mind, and never had "aucun but pour aucune action" but the making his court and his fortune, undertook this affair in the Mediterranean upon very unsafe and unwarrantable clandestine orders, transmitted to him from the late King, through the hands of Bernsdorf, his German minister. Lord Torrington succeeded, beat the Spaniards, put the Emperor in possession of Sicily, got vast sums of money, cheated the sailors, and returned home, thanked, caressed, and rewarded, instead of being censured, broke, or hanged; which, indisputably, he ought to have been, for risking an English fleet without a legal English authority.[19]

---

[19] This is altogether a mistake, into which, I see by old Lord Bristol's letters, that he may have led Lord Hervey, who was himself too young to have been acquainted with the details of the affair. It appears from '*An Account of the Expedition*,' &c., published in 1739 (which is confirmed by official documents), that Sir George Byng had *regular* orders from the Admiralty, dated 12th May, 1718, to follow such instructions as he should receive from his Majesty through his Secretary of State—a form not unusual for matters in which great secrecy or despatch might be necessary. These instructions were signed by the King on the 26th May, and officially con-

This was the man appointed to succeed Lord Berkeley. He had been in his youth a resolute, able, enterprising fellow; mercenary and knowing in his business; but now so declining in a very advanced age, that the edge of all these qualities, except his avarice, was pretty well blunted. He was now nothing more than an inferior man, weakened both in body and mind, neither able to execute or project any great things, and fit only to direct in the common routine of the sea affairs, which long experience in that business made him as capable of as any other man in the fleet. And as there had always been a jealousy, and no very cordial friendship, between him and Lord Berkeley, I believe Lord Torrington was pitched upon for this post, not so much from desiring to show him favour as to embitter Lord Berkeley's disgrace. The little friendship Lord Berkeley had ever professed to Sir Robert Walpole, and the little complaisance he had ever shown him, were certainly very natural reasons for Sir Robert to dislike, and to desire to remove him; and Lord Berkeley's great intimacy with and attachment to Lord Bolingbroke were the means he put into Sir Robert's hands to overturn his interest with the King, who mortally hated Lord Bolingbroke and everybody that had to do with him.[20]

veyed to Byng by Mr. Secretary Craggs, in a letter dated the 27th, which states that they had been personally discussed the day before between the Admiral, Lord Sunderland, Lord Stanhope, and Craggs. There is no trace of any Hanoverian minister in the affair.—See *Campbell's Adm.*, iv. 433.

[20] Horace Walpole gives an explanation of this disgrace very different, and so strange as to be hardly credible: "On the death of George I., Queen Caroline found in his cabinet a proposal of the Earl of Berkeley, then, I think, First Lord of the Admiralty, to seize the Prince of Wales, and convey him to America, whence he should never be heard of more. George I. was too humane to listen to such an atrocious deed."—*Reminiscences.*

However, this incident, as well as every other material occurrence at this time, proved to all mankind that the little transient interruption that diverted the stream of Sir Robert's power was now borne down; and that the current was brought back again and flowed quietly in its former channel. It was now understood by everybody that Sir Robert was the Queen's minister; that whoever he favoured, she distinguished; and whoever she distinguished, the King employed. His reputed mistress Mrs. Howard, and the Speaker his reputed minister, were perceived to be nothing; and Mr. Pulteney and Lord Bolingbroke, in the algebraical phrase, less than nothing: that is, it appeared very plain that his Majesty had no political regard for the first, no opinion of the capacity of the second, a dislike for the conduct of the third, and an abhorrence for the character of the last.

But as Sir Spencer Compton had conceived too strong hopes of being Sir Robert's superior ever to serve in the House of Commons quietly under him, and that it might be dangerous, consequently, to suffer him in the chair of a new Parliament, Sir Robert advised the making him a peer; accordingly he was created Baron of Wilmington; and on this occasion, I think, he might have said, like Agrippina, the mother of Nero, in Racine's 'Britannicus,'—

> "*Tous ces présens, hélas! irritent mon dépit,*
> *Je vois mes honneurs croître, et tomber mon crédit.*"

It was just his case; but he did not seem to feel the ridicule or the contemptibleness of his situation: that snowball levee of his, which had opened and that gathered so fast, melted away at as quick a pace; his visionary

prospects of authority and grandeur vanished into air;[21] and yet he seemed just as well satisfied to be bowing and grinning in the antechamber, possessed of a lucrative employment without credit, and dishonoured by a title which was the mark of his disgrace, as if he had been dictating in the closet, sole fountain of Court favour at home, and regulator of all the national transactions abroad.

Mrs. Howard (afterwards Countess of Suffolk) felt her situation in a very different manner; and though she was too wise and too prudent to have given herself the air of a favourite, without feeling she was so, or to have affected the appearance of power, without knowing whether she should be able to maintain it; yet, without doubt, she had tried her strength in private, and was mortified to find she had tried it to so little purpose,[22] well knowing that some degree of contempt would attend the not having what in her situation the world would expect her to have, though she had never pretended to be possessed of it; and that a mistress who could not get power was not a much more agreeable or respectable character than a minister who could not keep it.

---

[21] Swift, in one of his playful letters to Patty Blunt, alludes to the state of abandonment in which poor Sir Spencer was left:—"How will you pass this summer, for want of a squire to Ham Common or Walpole's Lodge? —for as to Richmond Lodge and Marble Hill, *they are abandoned as much as Sir Spencer Compton.*"

[22] This, though also so stated in the 'Reminiscences,' seems not quite exact. The *first* peer of the first batch made by the new King was Mrs. Howard's brother, Sir John Hobart; and while endeavouring to accomplish this great object for her own family, she was probably little inclined to risk her favour or her interest for the political objects of persons with whom she had no other tie than social acquaintance. See the Biographical Notice to the Suffolk Papers.

Mrs. Howard was of a good family, but of so numerous a one, that her fortune originally was a very small one.[23] She was sister to Lord Hobart, and had been married very young to Mr. Howard, a wrong-headed, ill-tempered, obstinate, drunken, extravagant, brutal younger brother of the Earl of Suffolk's family. This ill-matched, unfortunate couple were in a few years reduced to such low circumstances that they could not remain in England, and went, almost in despair, to make their court and seek their fortune, in Queen Anne's time, at Hanover. Mrs. Howard was there taken into the present Queen's service, and laid the foundation of that interest (such as it is) which she is now possessed of. Though the present King was never then said to think of her as a mistress, and when, immediately upon his first coming over, he attached himself to Mrs. Bellenden,[24] a Maid of Honour to the Princess, Mrs. Howard was always third of that party, and upon a very different foot from that on which her correspondence with the King is *now* thought to stand. Mrs. Bellenden, who was afterwards married to Colonel Campbell, was incontestably the most agreeable, the most insinuating, and the most likeable woman of her time; made up of every ingredient likely to engage or attach a lover. But as she had to do with a man incapable of being engaged by any charm but habit, or attached to any woman but his wife; a man who was

[23] Horace Walpole also calls her fortune "*a slender one*;" but she had 6000*l*.,—no inconsiderable sum in those days.

[24] Mary, youngest daughter of the second Lord Bellenden. Her husband became after her death fifth Duke of Argyll. See more of this charming woman (celebrated also by Gay and Pope) in the *Reminiscences* and the *Suffolk Correspondence*.

better pleased with the air of an intrigue than any other part of it—and who did not care to pay a valuable consideration even for that—she began to find out that her situation was only having the scandal of being the Prince's mistress without the pleasure, and the confinement without the profit: she, therefore, very wisely, resolved to withdraw her own neck as well as she could, little by little, out of this unpleasant yoke; and by this conduct she left Mrs. Howard, who had more steadiness and more perseverance, to try what she could make of a game which the other had found so tedious and so unprofitable, that she had no pleasure in playing it, and saw little to be won by continuing it.

The Prince passed, every evening of his life, three or four hours in Mrs. Howard's lodging, who, as dresser to the Princess, always in waiting, was lodged all the year round in the Court. Mrs. Bellenden continued to be now and then of these parties, till she married [about 1720], but after that time these visits became uninterrupted *tête-à-têtes* with Mrs. Howard, that subsist to this hour; and yet I know many of those who are most conversant and best acquainted with the intrigues, anecdotes, and transactions of this Court, who doubt, notwithstanding these appearances, the King's ever having entered into any commerce with her, that he might not innocently have had with his daughter. It is certain that nobody belonging to the Court ever believed he had succeeded with Mrs. Bellenden; and though all appearances (the duration of them excepted) were exactly the same with regard to both these ladies, yet there are many people (which seems very unac-

countable) who never suspected his success with the one, and never doubted it with the other.[25]

Mrs. Howard had the misfortune of hearing so ill that the quickness of her apprehension was in mixed companies of little use to her; for, unless the conversation was particularly addressed to her, and in a tone of voice much above the common pitch of speaking, she had no share in it: so that by this infirmity she was deprived not only of the pleasure but the advantage of the ordinary commerce of public and general acquaintance, and lost half the benefit of the many qualifications she possessed, so necessary to a thorough good companion, and so rarely united in one person. Good sense, good breeding, and good nature were qualities which even her enemies could not deny her; nor do I know any one good or agreeable quality which those who knew her more intimately would not as readily allow her. She was civil to everybody, friendly to many, and unjust to none: in short, she had a good head and a good heart, but had to do with a man who was incapable of tasting the one or valuing the other.[26]

---

[25] I noticed, in the Preface to the Suffolk Papers, with perhaps too much indulgence, the opinion that the friendship between the King and Mrs. Howard was platonic; but I am somewhat surprised to find Lord Hervey countenancing the same paradox, as I must candidly call it. The account that both he and H. Walpole give of the matter seems very strange —that the Prince should have waited for the marriage of Miss Bellenden to attach himself to a lady who had been in his family for so many years before he ever saw Miss Bellenden. It is more probable that the attachment began earlier.

[26] This is a large encomium from Lord Hervey, who was of the opposite faction in Court. Horace Walpole relates—as we shall see Lord Hervey also does—that when the Queen rather opposed Lady Suffolk's leaving the Court, the King complained to her that she "would not let him part with a *deaf* old woman that he was weary of."—*Reminiscences.* Pope turned the infirmity to a compliment:—

"Has

When the King came to the crown, Mrs. Howard was about forty years old,[27] an age not proper to make conquests, though perhaps the most likely to maintain them, as the levity of desiring new ones is by that time generally pretty well over, and the maturity of those qualities requisite to rivet old ones in their fullest perfection; for when the beauty that creates passion begins to decay, women commonly look out for some preservative charms to substitute in its place; they begin to change their notion of their right to being adored, into that of thinking a little complaisance and some good qualities as necessary to attach men as a little beauty and some agreeable qualities are to allure them; and as experience teaches them that the insolence and negligence of security often loses what the humility and circumspection of diffidence helps them to preserve, so they begin to find out that a solicitude to oblige is as essential to a woman's being loved and esteemed, as a capacity of pleasing is to her being liked and admired.[28] Mrs. Howard was so sensible of this truth, that her conduct tallied exactly with these sentiments; but notwithstanding her making use of the proper tools, the stuff she had to work with was so stubborn and so inductile that her labour was in vain, and her situation was such as would have been insupportable to any one whose pride was less

---

"Has she no faults, then (Envy says), sir?
Yes, she has one, I must aver:
When all the world conspire to praise her,
The *woman's deaf*, and will not hear."

[27] She was born, it seems, about 1688.—*Suffolk Papers*, vol. i. p. v. The King was forty-four.

[28] See Dean Swift's *Character* of Mrs. Howard, and the explanation of H. Walpole's misapprehension and misrepresentation on that subject which had been adopted by all succeeding writers.—*Suffolk Correspondence*, vol. i. p. xxxvii.

supple, whose passions less governable, and whose sufferance less inexhaustible; for she was forced to live in the constant subjection of a wife with all the reproach of a mistress; to flatter and manage a man whom she must see and feel had as little inclination to her person as regard to her advice; and added to this she had the mortification of knowing the Queen's influence so much superior to hers, that the little show of interest she maintained was only a permitted tenure dependent on a rival who could have overturned it any hour she pleased. But the Queen, knowing the vanity of her husband's temper, and that he must have some woman for the world to believe his mistress, wisely suffered one to remain in that situation whom she despised and had got the better of, for fear of making room for a successor whom he might really love, and that might get the better of her. On the other hand, Mrs. Howard was in the right to continue there even on this foot, since she could not put herself on any better; for though she had not all the advantages which the sole mistress to a king might expect, yet it enabled her at least to gain that very material point of bettering her fortune; and the exchanging indigence and distress for affluence and prosperity was a consideration that no doubt often comforted her in the many mortifications, disappointments, and rebukes which her ambition met with when she endeavoured to join the *éclat* and power of a king's mistress to those less agreeable appurtenances of that character, the scandal and confinement.[29]

However, these quotidian visits which his Majesty

[29] Compare H. Walpole's portrait and character of Mrs. Howard in the *Reminiscences*.

when Prince was known to bestow upon her, of so many hours in the four-and-twenty, and for so many years together, had made many superficial courtiers conclude that one who possessed so large a portion of his time must have some share in his heart. This way of reasoning induced many to make their court to her, and choose that channel to recommend themselves to the Prince. The most considerable of those who had done so were the Duke of Argyle, Lord Isla his brother, the Duke of Dorset, and Lord Wilmington, who none of them could persuade themselves of such inconsistencies and absurdities in any man's character, as to imagine the Prince could give all his leisure hours to a pretty and agreeable woman who had no weight in his counsels; nor was it more reasonable for them to imagine that any man would be so absolutely governed by his wife who took the liberty, in appearance at least, of being devoted to her chamber-maid; or to believe that he would receive no impressions in private but from the opinion of a woman whom he took such frequent opportunities to snub, rebuke, and contradict, whenever she delivered it before any standers by.

Whilst the King was Prince there were so few occasions for the Queen to show her credit with him, that some were apt to imagine this latent dormant power was much less than it proved itself when the time came that made it worth her while to try, show, and exert it. But as soon as ever the Prince became King, the whole world began to find out that her will was the sole spring on which every movement in the Court turned: and though his Majesty lost no opportunity to declare that the Queen never meddled with his business, yet nobody

was simple enough to believe it; and few besides himself would have been simple enough to hope or imagine it could be believed, since everybody who knew there was such a woman as the Queen, knew she not only meddled with business, but directed everything that came under that name, either at home or abroad. Her power was unrivalled and unbounded—how dearly she earned it will be the subject of future consideration in these papers.

At present, as everybody will be curious to learn what could induce the King to continue an administration whose every step he had disapproved, and heap favour on men whom he had so lately loaded with reproach—what motives he could have to lodge power in the hands of those whom he had heretofore so frequently and openly censured for the abuse of it; and how he as *King* came to consult those whom he never would speak to as *Prince;* and to admit no farther than the *drawing-room* at St. James's those favourites who had ever been of the *cabinet* at Leicester-House: in short—how he came to pursue the very same measures in his own reign which he had been constantly censuring and exploding in his father's;—since every one, I say, will be curious to learn what could give so unexpected a turn to his Majesty's way of thinking, talking, and acting, I shall relate all the different ways I heard of accounting for it at the time it happened; but whether any of the reasons given were the real ones, or whether all of them accumulated had some share in this event, I shall not pretend to determine.

For my own part, I have the conduct of princes in so little veneration, that I believe they act yet oftener

without design than other people, and are insensibly drawn into both good and bad situations without knowing how they came there. Those authors and commentators, then, must oftener than any others lose their time and their labour who will always be looking out for great causes to great events—by neglecting trifles they overlook truth, and by continual examens lose what they seek. I hold Epicurus's opinion of the system of the universe so strong with regard to almost all political revolutions in it, and think the fortuitous influence of chance so much more decisive of the success or miscarriage of statesmen's schemes, than the skill or dexterity of the most able and most artful of them, that I am apt to attribute much less to the one, and much more to the other, than the generality of historians, either from prejudice to their heroes or partiality to their own conjectures, are willing to allow. I think most of these political contenders for profit and power are, like Catiline and Cæsar, actuated by the same principles of ambition and interest, and that as their success determines their characters, so accident determines their success. Had Cæsar fallen in the plains of Pharsalia, like Catiline in those of Pistoia, they had both been remembered in the same manner; the different fortune of those battles is what alone constitutes the different characters of these two men, and makes the one always mentioned as the first and the other as the last of mankind.

But to return to our English history. Some were of opinion that Sir Robert Walpole's continuance was owing merely to the Speaker's want of resolution to displace him, he apprehending himself unequal to the

charge, and fearing to undertake what he should not be able to execute with credit, consequently not able to maintain for any time. Others imagine that he thought it would always be in his power to take the reins into his own hand, and only left them in Sir Robert Walpole's till his rival had driven through the dirty road of the Civil List; proposing by these means, that whatever odium was incurred by that regulation, it might all fall on Sir Robert's shoulders, without sullying the rising lustre of those ministers who would, after this was over, take the whole conduct and direction of affairs in the new system.[30]

Others think that Sir Robert found means to gain the Queen,[31] by making all his court solely to her, and that he did not weaken his interest with her by adding those two agreeable bribes of making her jointure (as before related) just double what had ever been given to a Queen of England before; and persuading the King to make her present establishment 60,000*l.* a year, which would have been 20,000*l.* more than the Speaker had given her, who proposed putting her establishment on the same footing with King Charles II.'s Queen. Sir Robert's solicitation, and the King's economy, split this difference, and settled her revenue at 50,000*l.*,

[30] Coxe states, on the authority of Sir Robert, from the Etough Papers, that Compton himself declined the King's pressing offer on the score of incapacity; but it seems as if this was only a civil mode of allowing him the honour of refusing what the King had now resolved not to bestow.

[31] The *Walpoliana* date Sir Robert's favour with the Queen earlier; stating that the *Princess* was angry with him for having called her in his coarse way *a fat bitch*—but that on the question of her jointure *as Princess*, 50,000*l.* being proposed, Sir Robert moved and obtained 100,000*l.*, upon which she good-humouredly sent him word that "the *fat bitch* had forgiven him."—§ 104. But this must be inaccurate. It was not as *Princess*, but as Queen, that the 100,000*l.* jointure was granted.

which was still 10,000*l.* more than any other Queen Consort had ever had, or the Speaker had cut out for her. Besides this, as Sir Spencer Compton and his reputed adherents had always in the late reign made their court more to Mrs. Howard than the Princess, it was not thought unlikely that her Royal Highness, as soon as she was Queen, might be influenced a little by her own resentment, though she persuaded the King to stifle his, and like to punish the neglect these people had been guilty of towards her by letting them feel their error, and at once showing them her own power, Mrs. Howard's impotence, and their mistake.

Whether or no these reasons induced the Queen to make choice of Sir Robert may be disputable, but it is an undoubted fact that she did make choice of him, and that by her influence the King—without getting the better of his dislike to him, at least at first—employed him.

It is very probable that when he talked to the King and Queen upon business (which it was necessary for him at first to do, in order to acquaint them with the situation of affairs), that they found him much more clear, more sensible, and more intelligible than the rest of them, and consequently believed him more able; that when he came to tell his own tale, to plead his own cause, and to describe the steps he had taken at home and abroad, in his own colours, the King and the Queen did not think his measures so ill-concerted, or the affairs of the nation in so bad a posture as his enemies had represented, and they perhaps expected to find them.

The arguments the Queen made use of in his behalf

to the King, to be sure were, that his long experience and approved abilities would certainly enable him to serve the King better than any other body; that his being so much in their power would also make him more humble and submissive than any other minister; that his having made a vast fortune already would make him less solicitous about his own interest, and more at liberty to mind the King's, than any that could succeed him; that new leeches would not be less hungry, and that *whoever* the King employed would at first be looking only after gain, and treading those paths which most people frequent at their entrance into power: whereas Sir Robert Walpole's fortune being already made, he would have nothing in view but the obliging his prince and securing the government, in order for him and his family to possess what he had already acquired in safety and tranquillity.[32] This being the case, no doubt she told his Majesty that wise princes always made their resentment yield to their prudence, and their passion to their interest; and that enmity as well as friendship in royal breasts should always give way to policy; and that whatever would strengthen his hands, confirm his power, and establish his government, should be consulted preferably to any other views whatever.

This doctrine of stifling his dislike and moderating his resentment was the language she had always talked

---

[32] This reminds one of the *naïf* saying of one of the French Ministers of Finance whom the King dismissed for some peculations:—"*Sa Majesté a tort; j'avais fais mes affaires, et j'allai faire les siennes.*" The Count de Broglie, the French Ambassador, writes confidentially to his Court, 20 July, 1724, that "Mr. Walpole is immensely rich, and disposed to retire from business, to enjoy his wealth."—*Coxe*, ii. 303. His paternal estate was a little over 2000*l.* a year.—*Ib.*, i. 6.

to him during his quarrel with his father when he was Prince; and by frequently inculcating such principles, she had prevailed with him in the late reign so far to suppress the natural warmth and vehemence of his temper, as not to push things to an extremity that could have done him little good at present, and might have endangered his future succession: and as he had once found the benefit of these mollifying, palliative counsels by a quiet and popular accession to the Crown, he was more easily, perhaps, brought to feel the force and propriety of such arguments in the present juncture of affairs, though very repugnant and unpalatable to his natural prompt disposition.

CHAPTER III.

Foreign Affairs—The Quadruple Alliance—Duke of Ripperda—Treaty of Vienna of 1725—Treaty of Hanover—State of France—Louis XV.—Cardinal Fleury—The King of Prussia—Forces of the respective parties to the Treaties.

THE situation of affairs abroad was no doubt another prevalent argument made use of by the Queen in favour of Sir Robert: for as England was at this time in alliance with no power in Europe of any weight but France, a change of the English administration might have alarmed France with the apprehension of a change of measures too, which as it would have weakened the harmony and good intelligence subsisting between these two crowns, so it would also have increased the demands and strengthened the hands of the common enemy.

Spain had already conceived such hopes of this change upon the demise of the late King, that though the preliminary articles for opening the Congress at Soissons were already signed, and brought to England the very same day with the news of the King's death; yet by a forced construction of the words in the article relating to Gibraltar, Spain raised a cavilling objection which put a stop to all proceedings at the Congress as effectually as if the preliminary articles had not been signed at all.

But in order to illustrate the situation of foreign affairs at this time, it will be necessary in a little short deduction of facts to take one cursory view of all the negotiations and transactions of the great Powers of

Europe from the time of the *first* Vienna Treaty in 1725, between the Emperor and Spain, which laid the foundation of all the subsequent treaties, and was the fountain of all the troubles and wrangles in which Europe had been involved from that time to this.

It will also be necessary afterwards, for the further explanation of these affairs, to give a transient narrative of the state and policy of every particular Court at this period, and to relate by whom these Courts were influenced, on what views they acted, and how these views were pursued.

The Treaty of Utrecht was the basis on which the peace of all the great Powers of Europe stood when King George I. came to the Crown; but notwithstanding that treaty, there remained many material points relating to the jarring interests of King Philip [of Spain] and the Emperor still unadjusted; and the mutual enmity that had subsisted between these two princes during their contention for the crown of Spain in the late war, was so ill reconciled, that the bringing them to temper with one another was a difficulty not yet got over.

But in the Treaty of London made in 1718 (a convention entered into between France, England, Holland, and the Emperor, and thence commonly called the Quadruple Alliance), an expedient was thought of to bring this reconciling project to bear; and indeed without this reconciliation it was impossible to put the peace of Europe on any solid or lasting foundation.

The expedient fixed upon was this:—The Emperor looking upon the kingdom of Naples as an insecure and precarious possession whilst Sicily was in any hands

but his own, it was proposed, in order to oblige and accommodate him, that the King of Sicily, to whom Sicily was given by the Treaty of Utrecht, should yield that island to the Emperor; that in lieu of it Spain should give up the island of Sardinia to the King of Sicily; and that Spain should be recompensed for that cession by settling the eventual succession to the Duchies of Tuscany, Parma, and Placentia, in case the present possessors died without sons, on Don Carlos, second son to the King of Spain, and eldest son to the present Queen; and this succession was to be secured to Don Carlos by the introduction of six thousand neutral Swiss troops (in the joint pay of France, England, and Spain), who were to garrison the chief ports and strong towns of these duchies.[1]

These two material and favourite points of the Courts of Vienna and Madrid once agreed to and settled, it was proposed, in order to adjust any little remaining punctilios and disputes between the two Courts, that a Congress should be opened at Cambray, and that the Crowns of France and England should there mediate between them.

Holland, though mentioned in the preamble to this treaty as one of the principal contracting parties, never acceded to it; and the accession of Spain was not made till two years after the treaty had been concluded.

The public reasons given on all hands for entering into this treaty were, that it was a treaty only explana-

[1] Philip V.'s first wife was Mary of Savoy, by whom he had two sons —Lewis, whom he seated on his own throne, but who died soon after, when Philip resumed it—and Ferdinand VI. By his second wife, Elizabeth of Parma, he had Don Carlos, heir in her right to the Duchies of Parma and Placentia, who eventually became Charles III. of Spain.

tory of that article of the Treaty of Utrecht relating to the neutrality of Italy, and necessary to settle the balance of Europe.

The motive of the Emperor to this alliance was evident, as it tended to put him immediately in possession of Sicily; and the chief if not the only view of the King of Great Britain, I believe, was to oblige the Emperor in this point, in order to purchase by such good offices the investiture of Bremen and Verden, which he so much wished and had so long solicited in vain.

The reason why France gave into it was certainly because the Duke of Orleans, who was then Regent of France, and by the act of renunciation[2] next heir to the crown, in case the King died without children, was glad to enter into any treaty in which that act of King Philip's renunciation was so formally and so strongly renewed: nor was he averse at this time and for this reason to the doing anything that would engage the Emperor and England to be more firmly his friends, in case that accident happened.

The reasons Spain had for being backward to accede to this alliance were, first, the King's being unwilling to renew and strengthen the renunciation to the Crown of France; and next, the desire Spain had to possess herself, if she could by force, of Sicily, as she had done, two years before, of Sardinia.

In order to compass this seizure, after the Quadruple Alliance was concluded, Spain sent a great fleet, under

[2] The renunciation of the Crown of France by Philip V., who was next heir to that Crown. It has been surmised that Philip's strange resignation of the Crown of Spain to his son was influenced by some design of retracting this renunciation.

the command of Admiral Castinetti, into the Mediterranean; at the same time England sent another to oppose them, under Lord Torrington: they fought—England was victorious, and Sicily put into the hands of the Emperor.[3]

And here lay the great defect either in the plan or the execution of the chief stipulations in the Quadruple Alliance; for as the putting the Emperor into the possession of Sicily, and the introduction of the six thousand Swiss troops for the security of Don Carlos's succession, were conditional articles, and dependent upon one another, so the contracting parties to this alliance ought never to have suffered a distinct and separate execution of the one without the other. The permitting the imperial troops to enter Sicily before the neutral troops entered into Parma and Tuscany was the occasion of all the subsequent difficulties that arose upon that point; as it gave the Emperor an occasion of making a thousand demurs and disputes, which he never would have thought of had they suspended at the same time the perfecting what he had so much at heart as the acquisition of Sicily.

This attempt of Spain on that island having miscarried, the Queen of Spain now turned her thoughts solely to the interest of her son Don Carlos; and not a little piqued, no doubt, at England, who had thrown this bar in her way when she thought to have possessed herself of Sicily, and treated upon the establishment of Don Carlos in Italy with that powerful mediator in her

[3] It is strange that Lord Hervey did not see that this historic series of circumstances effectually contradicts the imputation (*ante*, p. 50) that Sir George Byng's defence of Sicily was unauthorized.

hands. However, this design having proved abortive, she at last acceded to the Quadruple Alliance; acquiesced under the dispositions therein made for the security of her son's eventual succession to Parma and Tuscany; consented to the opening of the Congress at Cambray, and left the mediation there between Spain and the Emperor entirely to France and England.

But whilst this mock Congress was carrying on, the Duke de Ripperda, a projecting, speculating, enterprising, inconsiderate, hot-headed fellow, with great views rather than great parts, was sent by the Queen of Spain to Vienna, and there privately concluded a treaty between the Emperor and Spain.[4]

It would be both tedious and uninteresting here to enter into the detail of all the writings of these times for and against the English ministers, in which one side asserted and the other denied what was the purport of the secret articles of this treaty: it is possible the English ministers might say more than was true, in order to justify their precipitate entrance into the Treaty of Hanover; but it is certain that their opponents allowed

[4] See the history of this extraordinary adventurer in Coxe's 'Walpole' (c. 35). He was by birth a Dutch Protestant, sent in 1715 Envoy from Holland to Madrid, where he insinuated himself into the good graces of Cardinal Alberoni, under whose advice and countenance he turned Roman Catholic, and obtained employment in Spain, where he at length became first minister, and was created Duke de Ripperda, but in a few months was disgraced, and imprisoned for fifteen months in the tower of Segovia, whence he escaped (by means of and with a female servant, whom he attached to his fortunes) to England, where he lived a couple of years in great splendour, and was foolish enough to flatter himself for a while that he might become minister here. At length, in 1731, he returned to Holland; and subsequently, to revenge himself on Spain, entered the service of the Emperor of Marocco, turned Mahometan, became Prime Minister and General-in-Chief, but was, on another turn of fortune, disgraced, and he died at Tetuan in 1737, at a very advanced age.

a great deal too little when they at first denied that there was any secret treaty at all; and never to the last allowed that the tenor of those secret articles, if there were any, was such as affected the immediate interest of Great Britain, or ought to have alarmed us.

That there was some secret treaty was evident at first from the tendency of all the articles of the public treaty being only in favour of the Emperor, as the guarantee of the hereditary dominions of the House of Austria, privileges of trade, subsidies, &c.; and throughout the whole public treaty not the least mention made of Don Carlos's succession to Parma and Tuscany; which was a demonstration that there must be some secret stipulations in his favour, otherwise this favourite point would not have been neglected. Besides this, when Gibraltar came to be demanded by Spain, and that we upbraided the Emperor with having entered into engagements to assist Spain with force to regain that place, in case amicable applications failed, Count Staremberg, the Emperor's ambassador at London, showed the article relating to Gibraltar in the secret treaty, to clear the Emperor of having promised anything more than his good offices and mediation upon that head; which was so far indiscreetly done, as it was a confession that there was some secret treaty, which hitherto had been denied.

But, without expatiating further on this dispute between the English ministers and their opponents, I shall relate the matter of fact as I conceive it from the best lights I have been able to get on reading the whole controversy on both sides.

Between the public and private stipulations of this

Treaty of Vienna, I take the substance of it to have been this:—that the Emperor and Spain were to give one another reciprocal assistance in the maintenance of the Ostend Company,[5] and the restitution of Gibraltar; Spain was to guarantee the indivisible succession of the Austrian dominions to the Emperor's eldest daughter; the Queen of Spain's two eldest sons were to marry the two archduchesses; vast subsidies were to be paid by Spain to the Emperor; and all the same advantages of trade to either Indies were to be allowed by Spain to the Emperor that were granted by former treaties either to England or Holland.

It is easy to imagine that France and England, who had been appointed mediators between Spain and the Emperor, did not like the figure they made upon this occasion, though none of the articles or stipulations of this treaty openly avowed were contradictory to any in the Quadruple Alliance. However, Spain was so conscious that some apology was necessary for appointing France and England the pageant mediators in a quarrel which, notwithstanding that appointment, was made up without their privity, that she excused herself by saying she took her cause into her own hands on account of the affront put upon her by France in sending back the Infanta[6] and annulling that marriage with the King of France; and that England having refused, after this affront, to accept of the sole mediation and to act alone,

---

[5] The Ostend Company was a Belgian East India Company, which the Emperor was desirous of establishing in rivalry to the English and Dutch.

[6] The Infanta Mary Anne, born in 1718, sent to France in 1721, as the betrothed wife of the young Louis XV., was sent back by the Duke of Bourbon in 1725.

Spain was obliged either to act in this manner or not to have her affairs with the Emperor settled at all.

But this was only a plausible excuse for her conduct on this occasion, dates and facts proving that these were not her motives; for the sending back the Infanta was a measure not taken till the beginning of March, 1725, and by the end of the April following the Treaty of Vienna was concluded, signed, and arrived at Madrid; which could not have been, if it had only been projected in resentment of that step taken by the Court of France: and as to England's refusal of the sole mediation, that refusal being of a yet later date, it could have no sort of influence in setting the Treaty of Vienna on foot; so far from it, that this treaty was signed in form at Vienna, April 30, 1725, which was but a week after the King of England's refusal of the sole mediation was known at Madrid, and long before it could be known at Vienna [through Madrid]. Besides this, the Duke de Ripperda's full powers for making this treaty had been signed in November, 1724,[7] which was six months before the sending back the Infanta was thought of; and, consequently, as long before the sole mediation could have been proposed. So that the making this excuse only showed they thought some excuse necessary, and could not find one that would justify or avail them.

I have dwelt longer on this point, as the not accepting the sole mediation is the great fault imputed to our ministers by all those writers who have arraigned their conduct; but I think one may, with a great deal of

[7] Coxe says as early as October.

candour, pronounce that, if our ministers had accepted of the sole mediation at the time it was offered, they would have been guilty of a much greater error, both in justice and interest, and consequently in policy, than any that can now be laid to their charge. As to the justice of disjoining themselves from France upon this occasion, it can never be alleged that France having disobliged Spain was any reason why England should disoblige France; and of course no plea for England acting alone in a transaction which they had undertaken together. Thus much is to be said for the equity of the refusal, which in national transactions, I may be told perhaps, neither is nor ought ever to be considered. But supposing the interest of England only to be considered, it would certainly never have turned out for the advantage of England to have accepted this proposal, because it could have given a very reasonable disgust to the Court of France (with whom we were then in the strictest alliance), without giving us any merit towards Spain or the Emperor, whose reconciliation was already agreed on, and not left to be the work of our hands. So that our giving in to this proposal would have turned to no other account than proving ourselves the dupes of Spain, who could make this offer (all circumstances considered) with no other view than to weaken the union, sow jealousies, and create a coolness at this important crisis between France and England; and would at least have made England engross all the ridicule of being chosen public arbitrator in a quarrel already privately made up.

As for the real reasons the Courts of Madrid and Vienna had for entering into this treaty, if we will con-

sider the situation, the policy, and views of these two Courts at this period of time, and how far the stipulations and articles contained in this treaty were reciprocal gratifications of all the favourite points of the contracting parties, there want no refining conjectures to account for the setting such a scheme on foot, or the solicitude that each of these powers showed for putting it in execution.

The Emperor, as he is a prince who has very extensive and scattered territories, a great number of troops, and very little money, is always negotiating for the latter, in order to maintain the two others. He has generally very able servants both in civil and military affairs; and never had two more able than Prince Eugene and Zinzendorff, his principal counsellors at that time.

But by the whole tenor of the conduct of the court of Vienna, their maxims seem to be, to say anything, to promise anything, or to sign anything—that will serve the present purpose; to get what they can, without ever considering afterwards by whom, how, or when they were obliged; and, in short, to be just or unjust, grateful or ungrateful, say and unsay, make and unmake treaties, just as the present occurrence requires; and as money can be got by their entering into any engagements, adhering to them or departing from them. The vast personal obligations the present Emperor had to England on account of the last long war[8] never seemed

[8] The Succession War, for placing Charles on the throne of Spain. But such obligations are generally, as here, much exaggerated. England fought for what she thought *her own* interests, and not for the individual Charles of Austria.

to have any weight in his Imperial Majesty's resolutions, conduct, or counsels, for one moment, in any one step, or any one instance, ever after. The part England had taken in his cause during that expensive war in Spain was soon forgot by him, though the effects of that friendship remained too heavy a burden on the people of England, in debts and taxes, not to be still felt and remembered by them. The putting Sicily into his hands, though a more recent obligation, was not better acknowledged or remembered; for the investiture of Bremen and Verden, for which Lord Cadogan negotiated and Lord Torrington fought, was not granted, though promised, and probably was kept back in order to be held out once more as a bait to the next job in which the interposition of England should be wanted. The great and favourite points of the Court of Vienna were, getting money and subsidies—at any rate securing the undivided succession of the hereditary Austrian dominions in case the Emperor had no sons—the suffering no other power, if they could help it, to get footing in Italy—and the establishment of the Ostend Company. On these views the Emperor entered into this Treaty of Vienna with Spain in 1725, which answered them every one, for by the articles of this treaty he was to have immense subsidies paid to him by Spain for troops he was to furnish to besiege Gibraltar; he was to be supported in the establishment of the Ostend Company; and, by the marriage of his eldest daughter[9] to Don Carlos, the Queen of Spain's eldest son, he was to keep the hereditary Austrian dominions entire, and see his daughter's husband, who was eventual successor to the

[9] Maria Theresa, afterwards Queen of Hungary and Empress.

duchies of Parma and Tuscany, sole possessor of all Italy. But this treaty, by getting him too much, got him nothing (saving the subsidies); for when all the rest of Europe saw how very formidable a power might arise on this foundation — some justly, and others, I think, unjustly alarmed—judged it their joint interest to crush this project in the embryo. The English ministers pretend to affirm, that in this treaty, in case England should oppose the execution of it and the marriage of Don Carlos with the eldest archduchess, there was a secret article to impose the Pretender upon us, and make his concurrence to this treaty the condition of his restoration. Whether this really was so, or whether it was a story trumped up to excuse their very precipitate entrance into the Treaty of Hanover, is a point that never has, and in all probability never will,[10] be cleared: it is certain that the Duke de Ripperda, who then governed Spain, did, both at Madrid and Vienna, in very big blustering terms, often declare this to be his scheme; and that, if England was not quiet, she should repent her opposition, and be made to receive a King who would be more tractable, or at least more passive.

This was the situation of the Court of Vienna: as to that of Spain, it has partly been explained by the account of the other. The crown of Spain being on

[10] I know not that this point has been yet fully cleared up. Sir R. Walpole, on secret information, as he said—probably that of Ripperda—asserted the existence of this stipulation in his speech, 29 March, 1734. Coxe states that the documents to which he had access prove it; but he does not produce any such document. Lord Mahon also adopts these statements, but has not confirmed them by any additional authority. The fact is very probable; but it is observable that Lord Hervey, who at least revised these memoirs some years later, and was so long in the full confidence of Walpole, still speaks very doubtfully of it.

the head of a man who had once abdicated it, then taken it again, and again wished to lay it aside—one who was half fool and half madman—he had little or no share in any act of that Court; he was governed entirely by his wife, an Italian by birth, whose sole view was aggrandizing her own children, and securing herself a retreat in Italy in case she outlived her husband, whose brains and constitution were equally crazy and broken. The Prince of Asturias [Ferdinand], her husband's son by a former wife, being heir to the crown of Spain, she never considered the interest of that kingdom in any of her negotiations; and though her eldest and favourite son, Don Carlos, had the eventual succession of Parma and Tuscany secured to him by the Quadruple Alliance, yet the Duke de Ripperda had so extended her views for Don Carlos's grandeur, by this scheme of the Vienna Treaty, that, lured and elated by those hopes of marrying him to the archduchess, making him Emperor, and getting him all Italy, she lost sight of what was feasible in order to pursue what was impracticable; and draining the treasures of Spain (though supplied by the Indies) to bribe the favour and supply the indigence of the Court of Vienna, she ran away with this extravagant chimerical scheme, forgot or neglected the succession of Parma and Tuscany, as little things not worth thinking of, and alarmed and embroiled all Europe with this project, which a mad minister had put into the head of this mad Queen, whose influence over her mad husband was sufficient to lead him blindfold into this or any other mad project she thought fit.

But to oppose the execution of this Treaty of

Vienna, France and England entered immediately, in 1725, into the Treaty of Hanover, called a defensive treaty: the chief object of it was, I believe, a piece of flattery of Lord Townshend's to the late King, who was piqued at not having been able to obtain the investiture of Bremen and Verden, looked upon himself as the Emperor's dupe, and was glad to lay hold of the first pretence he could find to do anything that would thwart his Imperial Majesty's inclination, combat his interest, or mortify his pride. The public reasons given out for setting this Treaty of Hanover on foot were,—the alarm all Europe had taken upon the sudden, unnatural, clandestine, and formidable conjunction of these two great powers, the Empire and Spain; the expediency of forming some counter-alliance to make a stand against the union, and preserve the balance of power in Europe; and the necessity there was of putting a stop to the intended marriage of Don Carlos, by early protesting against it. The dangerous consequences which the contracting parties to the Treaty of Hanover said all Europe might apprehend from this match were these:—first, that it would demonstrably and inevitably unite all Italy to the Empire after the death of the present Emperor; in the next place, as there was only the Prince of Asturias's life between Don Carlos and the crown of Spain, so very probably Spain might be added to those vast possessions; and, besides this, the King of France having then no children, there was a possibility even of that crown also devolving to Don Carlos, and his being consequently, if not universal monarch of Europe, at least a power too strong for any of the rest, or all of them put toge-

ther, to contend with. All these contingencies and possible events considered, the allies of Hanover insisted on this match being repugnant to the interest of every state in Europe, and consequently the business of all Europe to oppose and prevent it. In the mean time, pursuant to the stipulations of the Treaty of Vienna, immense remittances were made to the Emperor: soon after, Gibraltar was demanded by Spain, in consequence of an equivocal promissory letter, written by the late King[11] to the King of Spain; and those demands not being complied with, the siege of Gibraltar was opened.

In consequence of this Treaty of Hanover, three great fleets were immediately fitted out on the part of England; one of which was sent to the coast of Spain to protect our merchant-ships and to be ready to defend Gibraltar; another was ordered to the West Indies to block up the galleons in Porto Bello, and prevent the arrival of money in Spain, without which the allies of the Vienna Treaty could not put the articles of it in execution; and the third sailed into the Baltic to secure (as was pretended) the pacification of the North and defend Sweden in case she acceded to the Treaty of Hanover from the resentment of the Moscovite, who was joined with the Emperor and would have been glad of any pretence to attack her. These were the reasons given for the equipment of this third expensive fleet, whilst the strongest, which was the security and defence of Bremen and Verden, operated only in secret.

[11] The details of this very questionable transaction are to be found in Coxe, i. 308, &c.

France was at this time governed entirely by Cardinal Fleury; he was, though not nominally, yet virtually, First Minister, and with undivided sway; he had been about the King from his infancy, and had such full possession of him, that from the time of Monsieur le Duc's[12] disgrace nobody but the Cardinal ever spoke to him of any business whatever. This monopoly of the King's ear and confidence the Cardinal owed partly to his Majesty's opinion of him and an habitual attachment that people mistook for affection, and partly to the King's natural laziness and dislike to letting many people know how ignorant he was in his own affairs, which was a defect he had just sense enough to feel and be ashamed of, but not resolution and application enough to correct and amend. I cannot, by the best accounts I have had, or by what I have myself seen of this insensible piece of royalty, venture absolutely to say that he was of a good or a bad disposition, for, more properly speaking, he was of no disposition at all; he was neither merciful nor cruel, without affection or enmity, gratitude or resentment, and, to all appearances, without pleasure or pain. Whatever he did seemed rather the mechanical operations of an automaton than the result of the will and direction of a rational being. The state of his mind on all occasions seemed still to be an entire apathy, unacting and unmoved; if he had any passion it was avarice, and if he took pleasure in any amusement it was in gaming. He had not any share in that epidemical gaiety and alacrity that runs through the generality of the French

[12] The Duke de Bourbon, who succeeded the Regent as First Minister in 1723, was dismissed in 1726, and died in 1740.

nation; but seemed to take as little pleasure as he gave, to live to as little purpose to himself as to anybody else, and to have no more joy in being King than his people had advantages from being his subjects.

It was lucky for France that the sole management of this regal puppet fell at last [1726] into the Cardinal's hands; for though his Eminence was not a man of the first-rate parts, the brightest talents, or the most elevated genius, yet he had a good plain practical understanding, was a prudent minister, and an honest man. He was disinterested and conscientious, candid, open, steady, and unfeignedly pious. He loved the King with the affection of a parent as well as the duty of a subject, served his country with the zeal of the warmest patriot, and considered mankind with the justice and charity of the strictest Christian; what faults he had were emanations from his virtues; for his support of the Jesuits to a degree that might be called an oppression and persecution of their great opponents, the Jansenists, proceeded only from too strict an adherence to what he thought the truth, the safety of the Government, and the welfare of the people. He always believed the principles of the Jansenists to be as strong for liberty in State as in Church matters, and that if ever they were given way to in the one, they would quickly gain ground in the other, and cause, of course, such convulsions in the Government that nobody could foresee where the consequences of such a spirit would end, nor how far it might operate when assisted by the particular vivacity of the French nation and the general love of innova-

tion and freedom in all mankind. Those actions which got him the character of a covetous, griping minister were only the consequences of rather too sparing and frugal a dispensation of the King's treasure, which he found in so dissipated a condition at his entrance into power, that it required at first the strictest economy to bring it into any order, method, or credit.

He had no view in what he saved to enriching himself or his family; the nepotism of other Cardinals and almost all Popes had no influence in his conduct, for he had but two nephews, one in the marine and the other in the church, and to avoid the reproach of partiality to his own blood at the expense of the public, he neglected their advancement, even to a fault.

His great principle in politics was to keep peace [13] in Europe as long as it was possible, and by his adherence to this principle France, during his administration, recovered all the havoc and distress and misery that had been brought upon her by a series of so many years' mismanagement in his predecessors'. She no longer groaned under the consequences of the imprudent, obstinate, and boundless ambition of Lewis XIV., nor the misfortunes generally entailed on the people by long, expensive, and unsuccessful wars. The profligacy, extravagance, and dissipation of the Duke of Orleans' regency, and the confusion of Mr. Law's Mississippi scheme, were no longer felt, any more than the bad effects of the succeeding times, when the Government, falling into the hands of that weak, ignorant, and indolent Prince, Monsieur le Duc, France suffered all those hardships which must naturally and unavoid-

[13] "Peace is my dear delight—not Fleury's more."—*Pope.*

ably be brought on a nation when the supineness of such a governor leaves the rapaciousness of such an abandoned, unfeeling, and unprincipled a woman as his mistress, Madame de Prie, full scope and plenitude of power to act all the follies, oppressions, and injustices that passion, avarice, vanity, and insolence can suggest.

This was the state of France when the Cardinal came into the Hanover Treaty, which, without being repugnant to his pacific principles, was consonant to the inherent and fundamental policy of all Frenchmen, who are naturally jealous of the power of the House of Austria, and always ready to enter into any measures to check and confine it.

To oppose the execution then of the Vienna Treaty made between the Emperor and Spain, France and England formed the Hanover Treaty, September 3, 1727, when the late King was at Hanover. As soon as this treaty was concluded, to which England, France, and Prussia were the original contracting parties, copies of it were sent to all the Courts and little States in Europe; and whilst the Emperor and Spain were soliciting, on one hand, for accessions to their Treaty of Vienna, England and France were, on the other, strengthening, by as many powers as they could list, the alliance of Hanover.

The defection of the King of Prussia from the latter was a sudden turn, and proceeded partly from a fear of his superior, the Emperor, and partly from a sullen, envious hatred he bore to his father-in-law, the King of England, who, from the time of his advancement to that crown, sank in his son-in-law's favour, just in the same proportion as he rose above him in grandeur.

This was a great loss to the allies of Hanover, the King of Prussia having a standing force of 70,000 men. The forces of Spain were about 60,000, besides their naval power; and the army of the Emperor in all, after the new levies, about 200,000. Muscovy was the only considerable power, besides Prussia, that acceded to the Treaty of Vienna; for whilst the Czarina alone obliged herself, in case of a rupture, to furnish 30,000 men, the Electors of Bavaria, Cologne, and Treves, besides several other little German Princes that his Imperial Majesty had bullied, cajoled, or bought into his party, could muster no more than 27,000 men when all their forces were clubbed together.

To the Hanover alliance came in Holland, Sweden, and Denmark. Holland augmented her forces from 30,000 to 50,000 men by land, and by sea had eighteen men-of-war ready to sail. The quota of Sweden, by virtue of their treaty, was 5000 men, and 10,000 more they were to have ready in consideration of a yearly subsidy of 100,000*l.* for three years, paid jointly by France and England. Denmark was to have 24,000 men standing troops, and for a subsidy paid by France for four years was to augment their forces to 30,000 if required. France increased her regular troops 30,000 men, which made them in all amount to 160,000. They had also a disciplined militia of 60,000 men, sea-magazines, artillery, and ammunition ready to take the field, and for sea-services they fitted out this year twelve men-of-war.

The King of England, as Elector, increased his troops from 16,000 to 22,000 men, and as King of England from 18,000 to 26,000 men; 20,000 men

were also voted by the Parliament that year for the sea-service, and 12,000 Hessians were taken into the pay of Great Britain alone, at an expense of 240,000*l.* a year. This subsidy caused so much clamour in Parliament and so much disaffection throughout the whole nation, that I shall speak of it hereafter more at large.

Thus almost all the powers of Europe were engaged directly or indirectly in support of the Treaty of Vienna or Hanover respectively, whilst the accumulated land-forces of the first and all their allies amounted to about 387,000 men, and of the latter to about 315,000 men.

In this perplexed, entangled, and amphibious state of broken peace and undeclared war did King George II. at his accession to the throne find the political affairs of Europe.

CHAPTER IV.

New Parliament—The Coronation—Creation of Peers—Mrs. Clayton—Queen's Management of the King—Libels—Character of Lord Scarborough and of Lord Chesterfield compared.

As soon as his Civil List was settled the old Parliament was dismissed, and soon after a new one called. The choice of this new Parliament was consigned entirely to the care of Sir Robert Walpole, which confirmed the whole world in the opinion of the King's being determined to continue him First Minister, everybody being capable, without much penetration or refinement, to reason, that a man who was to have his friends, followers, and adherents removed from Court would never have Court-money given him to bring them into Parliament.

In October the ceremony of the Coronation was performed with all the pomp and magnificence that could be contrived; the present King differing so much from the last, that all the pageantry and splendour, badges and trappings of royalty, were as pleasing to the son as they were irksome to the father. The dress of the Queen on this occasion was as fine as the accumulated riches of the City and suburbs could make it; for besides her own jewels (which were a great number and very valuable) she had on her head and on her shoulders all the pearls she could borrow of the ladies of quality at one end of the town, and on her petticoat

all the diamonds she could hire[1] of the Jews and jewellers at the other; so that the appearance and the truth of her finery was a mixture of magnificence and meanness not unlike the *éclat* of royalty in many other particulars when it comes to be nicely examined and its sources traced to what money hires or flattery lends.

Soon after the King came to the crown[2] he made Sir John Hobart, Sir Thomas Wentworth, Sir William Monson, and Sir Thomas Coke peers by the titles of Lord Hobart, Lord Malton, Lord Monson, and Lord Lovel.

When first the Queen's power with the King began to appear (which was as soon as ever he was King) people made great court to Mrs. Clayton, one of the women of her bedchamber. This lady having been always thought her favourite when Princess, and from her first coming over constantly in her service, and seemingly in her confidence, everybody imagined she would have power in the new reign; but Sir Robert Walpole, either jealous of her interest from not believing her cordially in his, or thinking he wanted no assistance, soon clipped the wing of her ambition, and showed the world that as he wanted no pinions but his own to support him, so he would suffer no other to approach.

Mrs. Clayton[3] had a head fitter for a Court than

[1] There was some little excuse for this. "At the death of Queen Anne, such a clearance had been made of her Majesty's jewels, or the new King had so instantly distributed them among his German favourites, that Lady Suffolk told me Queen Caroline never obtained of the late Queen's jewels but one pearl necklace."—*Reminiscences.*

[2] This creation was in May, 1728.

[3] Charlotte Dyves, wife of William Clayton, a Lord of the Treasury, created

her temper, her passions being to the full as strong as her understanding; and as the one hindered her from being blind to people's faults, the other often hindered her too from seeming so. She had sense enough to perceive what black and dirty company, by living in a Court, she was forced to keep; had honour enough to despise them, and goodness enough to hate them, and not hypocrisy enough at the same time to tell them they were white and clean. I knew her intimately, and think she had really a warm, honest, noble, generous, benevolent, friendly heart; and if she had the common weakness of letting those she wished ill to see it, she had in recompense the uncommon merit of letting those she wished well to not only see, but feel it. She had so great a pleasure in doing real good that she frequently employed the interest she had at Court in favour of people who could no way repay her, and often for such as had not even solicited it; and by this conduct reversed the manners and maxims of most courtiers and politicians, as she seemed generally in the obligations she conferred to consider more who wanted

---

in 1735 Baron Sundon of Ireland, was of the same Court faction as Lord Hervey, and therefore his report may have been partial; that of Horace Walpole is not so complimentary. He calls her "an absurd, pompous simpleton," whose favour with the Queen arose from her "having wormed herself into the secret of her Majesty's being afflicted with a rupture, which no other person knew but the King and her German nurse:" but the *favour* had preceded the alleged ground of it many years. Walpole states she employed her interest corruptly. "Lady Sundon had received a pair of diamond ear-rings as a bribe for procuring a considerable post in Queen Caroline's family for a certain peer [Lord Pomfret]; and, decked with these jewels, paid a visit to old Sarah Duchess of Marlborough, who as soon as she was gone said—'What an impudent creature, to come here with her bribe in her ear!' 'Madam,' replied Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, who was present, 'how should people know where wine is sold unless a bush is hung out?'" But see *post*, i. 448, n. 11, ii. 184, n. 5, and 506, n. 12.

her than whom *she* wanted—a way of thinking very different from that of her master and mistress, who looked upon human kind as so many commodities in a market, which, without favour or affection, they considered only in the degree they were useful, and paid for them in that proportion — Sir Robert Walpole being sworn appraiser to their Majesties at all these sales.

Mrs. Clayton and Mrs. Howard hated one another very civilly and very heartily, but not in equal constraint; for whilst Mrs. Clayton was every moment like Mount Etna, ready to burst when she did not flame, Mrs. Howard was as much mistress of her passions as of her limbs, and could as easily prevent the one from showing she had a mind to strike, as she could the other from giving the blow: her passions, if I may be allowed the comparison, were like well-managed horses, at once both hot and tractable. The enmity between these two ladies was a very natural consequence of their situations, the one having been always attached to the master, and the other to the mistress: each was jealous of the other's interest, and each over-rated it; for as soon as their power (had they had any) came to have an opportunity of showing itself, the whole world perceived that the reputed favourite of the *Princess* had as little real weight with the Queen as the reputed mistress of the *Prince* had with the King.

And as people now plainly saw that all Court interest, power, profit, favour, and preferment were returning in this reign to the same track in which they had travelled in the last, lampoons, libels, pamphlets, satires, and ballads were handed about, both publicly and privately,

some in print and some in manuscript, abusing and ridiculing the King, the Queen, their Ministers, and all that belonged to them: the subject of most of them was Sir Robert's having bought the Queen, and the Queen's governing the King; which thought was over and over again repeated in a thousand different shapes and dresses, both of prose and verse. And as the 'Craftsman'[4] had not yet lashed their Majesties out of all feeling for these transitory verbal corrections that smart without wounding and hurt without being dangerous, so the King's vehemence and pride, and the Queen's apprehension of his being told of her power till he might happen to feel it, made them both at first excessively uneasy. However, as the Queen by long studying and long experience of his temper knew how to instil her own sentiments, whilst she affected to receive his Majesty's, she could appear convinced whilst she was controverting, and obedient whilst she was ruling; and by this means her dexterity and address made it impossible for anybody to persuade him what was truly his case—that whilst she was seemingly on every occasion giving up her opinion and her will to his, she was always in reality turning his opinion and bending his will to hers. She managed this deified image as the heathen priests used to do the oracles of old, when, kneeling and prostrate before the altars of a pageant god, they received with the greatest devotion and reverence those directions in public which they had before instilled and regulated in private. And as these idols consequently were only propitious to the favourites of the augurers, so nobody who had not tampered with our

[4] This celebrated paper had commenced only the year before.

chief *priestess* ever received a favourable answer from our god: storms and thunder greeted every votary that entered the temple without her protection; calms and sunshine those who obtained it. The King himself was so little sensible of this being his case, that one day enumerating the people who had governed this country in other reigns, he said Charles I. was governed by his wife; Charles II. by his mistresses; King James by his priests; King William by his men—and Queen Anne by her women—favourites. His father, he added, had been by anybody that could get at him. And at the end of this compendious history of our great and wise monarchs, with a significant, satisfied, triumphant air, he turned about, smiling, to one of his auditors, and asked him—"And who do they say governs now?" Whether this is a true or a false story of the King, I know not, but it was currently reported and generally believed. The following verses will serve for a specimen of the strain in which the libels, satires, and lampoons of these days were composed:—

"You may strut, dapper[5] George, but 't will all be in vain;
We know 'tis Queen Caroline, not you, that reign—
You govern no more than Don Philip of Spain.
Then if you would have us fall down and adore you,
Lock up your fat spouse, as your dad did before you."[6]

This was one of the poetical pasquinades that were

---

[5] George II. was very short. One of the lampoons on him describes the pleasure with which he received Mr. (afterwards Lord) Edgcumbe, who was very low in stature:—

"Rejoiced to find within his court
One shorter than himself!"

[6] Sophia Dorothea of Zell, wife of King George I., was confined by her husband in the castle of Ahlen for thirty-two years, and died there only seven months before the King.

handed about in manuscript at this time. There was another that began—

> "Since England was England, there never was seen
> So strutting a King, and so prating a Queen," &c.

and several more of the same stamp and in the same style. People found they galled, and that increased the number of them. The first of those I have cited had like to have been fatal to Lord Scarborough. Upon being taxed by the King with having seen it, he confessed he had so, but refused absolutely to say by whom it had been shown him, assuring his Majesty that previously to his reading it or to the knowing what it was, he had given his honour never to tell through whose hands he received it. The King, with great warmth and anger, said to him—"Had I been Lord Scarborough in this situation and you King, the man should have shot me, or I him, who had dared to affront me, in the person of my master, by showing me such insolent nonsense." Lord Scarborough replied, he had never told his Majesty that it was a *man* from whom he had it, and persisting in the concealment he had promised, left the King (who never spoke to him for some months after) almost as much irritated against him as the author.

Lord Scarborough had been in the King's service as Master of the Horse, when he was Prince, from the time the Hanover family first came into England; on the King's accession to the throne he was continued in that post, and the first officer declared: he was a man of worth, family, quality, sense, figure, character, and honour: he had the Garter given him in the late reign; was bred in a camp, and from thence brought to Court,

and had all the gallantry of the one and the politeness of the other: he was amiable and beloved, two things which, though they ought, do not always meet; he was of the Cabinet Council, and was equally fit to be trusted in the most important affairs, or advised with in the most delicate; having knowledge, application, and observation, an excellent judgment, and (without the brilliant éclat of showy parts) a discerning, practical, useful, sound understanding. His education had inclined him a little too much to the love of an army.[7] He was one of the best speakers of his time in the House of Lords; clear in his matter, forcible in his expression, and gave weight not only by his words, but by his character, to any cause he maintained, or any opinion he inclined to.

When first the King came to the Crown, Lord Chesterfield was thought to have interest. The accident of his being in waiting at that time as Lord of his Bedchamber gave him that appearance of interest to those who judge of Courts by appearances; and his having been long a declared enemy of Sir Robert Walpole's, made the speculative part of the world conclude it. Lord Chesterfield was allowed by everybody to have more conversable entertaining table-wit than any man of his time; his propensity to ridicule, in which he indulged himself with infinite humour and no distinction, and with inexhaustible spirits and no discretion, made him sought and feared, liked and not loved, by most of his acquaintance; no sex, no relation, no rank, no power, no profession, no friendship, no obligation, was

[7] Lord Hervey had been brought up by his father in the old Whig prejudice against a standing army.

a shield from those pointed, glittering weapons, that seemed to shine only to a stander-by, but cut deep in those they touched. All his acquaintance were indifferently the objects of his satire, and served promiscuously to feed that voracious appetite for abuse that made him fall on everything that came in his way, and treat every one of his companions in rotation at the expense of the rest. I remember two lines in a satire of Boileau's that fit him exactly:—

> "Mais c'est un petit fou qui se croit tout permis,
> Et qui pour un bon mot va perdre vingt amis."

And as his lordship, for want of principle, often sacrificed his character to his interest, so by these means he as often, for want of prudence, sacrificed his interest to his vanity. With a person as disagreeable as it was possible for a human figure to be without being deformed, he affected following many women of the first beauty and the most in fashion; and, if you would have taken his word for it, not without success; whilst in fact and in truth he never gained any one above the venal rank of those whom an Adonis or a Vulcan might be equally well with, for an equal sum of money. He was very short, disproportioned, thick, and clumsily made; had a broad, rough-featured, ugly face, with black teeth, and a head big enough for a Polyphemus.[8] One Ben Ashurst, who said few good things, though admired for many, told Lord Chesterfield once that he was like a stunted giant—which was a humorous idea

[8] This is very different from his portraits, which represent a handsome and intellectual countenance, and indicate a fine, or at least an elegant, figure and air. Even admitting that the painters flattered, and that Lord Hervey caricatured, I am at a loss to account for so violent a contrast.

and really apposite. Such a thing would disconcert Lord Chesterfield as much as it would have done anybody who had neither his wit nor his assurance on other occasions; for though he could attack vigorously, he could defend but weakly, his quickness never showing itself in reply, any more than his understanding in argument.

Part of the character which Bishop Burnet gives of his grandfather, the Marquis of Halifax, seems to be a prophetic description of Lord Chesterfield,—at least he has an hereditary title to it:—

"The liveliness of Lord Halifax's imagination (says the Bishop) was always too hard for his judgment: a severe jest was preferred by him to all arguments whatsoever; and if he could find a new jest to make even what he himself had suggested in counsel just before seem ridiculous, he could not hold, but would study to raise the credit of his wit, though it made others call his judgment in question."

When the distribution of places, changes, and promotions was making at the beginning of this reign, the King told Sir Robert Walpole he would have something done for Chesterfield. Sir Robert, who did not dislike removing so declared an enemy to a little distance from the King's ear, proposed sending Lord Chesterfield Ambassador to Holland; and Lord Chesterfield, afraid to act against Sir Robert, and ashamed to act under him, gave in to this proposal; thinking it would allow people time to forget the declarations he had made of never forgiving Sir Robert, and save him from a little of that ridicule which the laughers of his acquaintance would be apt to lavish upon him when they saw him listed again under the banner of a man he had formerly

deserted, and against whom he had so long fought with his wit, that only weapon with which he cared for fighting.[9]

If anybody had a friendship for Lord Chesterfield, it was Lord Scarborough; yet it was impossible to see a stronger contrast of character in any two men, who neither wanted understanding, but the sort of understanding each of them possessed was almost as different as sense and nonsense: Lord Scarborough always searching after truth, loving it, and adhering to it; whereas Lord Chesterfield looked on nothing in that light—he never considered what was true or false, but related everything in which he had no interest just as his imagination suggested it would tell best; and, if by sinking, adding, or altering any circumstance, it served either the purpose of his interest, his vanity, or his enmity, he would dress it up in that fashion without any scruple, and oftentimes with as little probability; by which means, as much as he piqued himself on being distinguished for his wit, he often gave people a greater opinion of the copiousness of his invention and the fertility of his imagination than he desired—an idle schoolboy being as capable of changing facts as a Socrates or a Cicero. Lord Scarborough had understanding, with judgment, and without wit; Lord Chesterfield, a speculative head, with wit, and without

---

[9] Lord Mahon says (*Preface to Works*)—"The first outset of Lord Chesterfield in public life was his embassy to Holland;" but (besides having long been a Lord of the Prince's Bedchamber) he was in 1723, while Lord Stanhope, made Captain of the Gentlemen Pensioners, which he resigned in 1725, on some difference with Sir Robert Walpole, which, as well as a speech of his to the King, I presume on the same occasion, made a noise at the time. The details have not reached us.—See *Suff. Cor.*, i. 183.

judgment. Lord Scarborough had honour and principle; Lord Chesterfield, neither: the one valued them wherever he saw them; the other despised the reality, and believed those who seemed to have most, had generally only the appearance, especially if they had sense. Patriotism, adherence to a party, the love of one's country, and a concern for the public, were his common topics for ridicule; he would not scruple to own that he thought the laws of honour in men, and the rules of virtue in women, like the tenets of an established religion, very proper things to inculcate, but what the people of sense and discernment, of both sexes, professed without regarding, and transgressed whilst they recommended. Nor were the tempers of these two men more alike than their understanding or their principles; Lord Scarborough being generally splenetic and absent; Lord Chesterfield always cheerful and present: everybody liked the character of the one, without being very solicitous for his company; and everybody was solicitous for the company of the other, without liking his character. In short, Lord Scarborough was an honest, prudent man, capable of being a good friend; and Lord Chesterfield a dishonest, irresolute, imprudent creature, capable only of being a disagreeable enemy.

CHAPTER V.

Meeting of Parliament—Speaker Onslow—Iniquitous decision of Election Petitions—Preliminary Articles of Peace—Vote of Credit—Sir Thomas Hanmer—Congress of Soissons—Rupture between Walpole and Townshend—Its causes—Character of Townshend—Houghton—Townshend Party—Miss Skerrett.

ABOUT the middle of January, 1728, the Parliament met; Sir Spencer Compton, who had been Speaker fourteen years, being now created Lord Wilmington, a new one was to be chosen, and Mr. Onslow pitched upon to be the man. As he had no great pretensions to it, from his age, his character, his weight in the House, or his particular knowledge of the business, Sir Robert Walpole imagined that he must look upon his promotion entirely as an act of his favour, and consequently think himself obliged, in honour, interest, and gratitude, to show all the complaisance in his power to his patron and benefactor. However, Mr. Onslow had just that degree of fitness for this office, when he was first put into it, that hindered the world from exclaiming against him, and yet was not enough for him to take it as his due. He was a man naturally eloquent, but rather too florid;[1] was as far from wanting parts or

[1] "It has been observed that the Chair of the House of Commons seldom fails to impart to its occupants a certain florid stateliness of diction and demeanour, like what would be called in common life *pomposity*."—Quarterly Review of the Life of Lord Sidmouth, vol. 79, p. 485. It might have been added, that a predisposition to this florid manner seems sometimes to have attracted the choice of the House.

application, as he was from possessing prudence or judgment; he had kept bad company of the collegiate kind, by which he had contracted a stiffness and pedantry in his manner of conversing; and whilst he was thoroughly knowing in past times, was totally ignorant of the modern world. No man ever courted popularity more, and to no man popularity was ever more coy: he cajoled both parties, and obliged neither; he disobliged his patron by seeming to favour his opponents, and gained no credit with them because it was only seeming. He had one merit truly and sincerely (as I believe, at least), which was an attachment to the constitution of England, and a love of liberty that never gave way; and was certainly no favourer of the power of the Crown or the Church. But these true Whig and laudable principles were so daubed by canting, fulsome, bombast professions, that it was as hard to find out whether there was anything good at bottom, as it would be to find out real beauty in a painted lady. In general he was passionate in his temper, violent in his manner, coxcomical in his gestures, and injudicious in his conduct.[2]

The King was forced to meet his Parliament with a sort of hereditary speech, for it was just in the same strain with the last half-dozen of his father's,—the topics of which were the uncertain state of Europe, the intricacy of affairs, the natural protraction of treaties, the hopes of a happy conclusion being near at hand, and the dependence he had in the loyalty and goodwill of his Parliament for supporting him with money and

[2] He was Speaker for thirty-three years (1728—1761), in five parliaments, with universal approbation.

troops. He concluded this part of royal oratory with recommending unanimity in their proceedings, and desiring (not in so many words, but by strong implication) an entire confidence in him and his ministers; and an implicit belief that it was impossible for him to take any step that was not for the welfare and prosperity of his people.[3]

There was little business to do in this Session besides that of giving the supplies for the current service of the year, and hearing petitions on elections.[4] As to the first, they were granted with a most liberal hand; and as to their proceedings with regard to the last of these occupations, I believe the manifest injustice and glaring violation of all truth in the decisions of this Parliament surpass even the most flagrant and infamous instances of any of their predecessors. They voted in one case forty more than ninety; in another they cut off the votes of about seven towns and some thousand voters, who had not only been determined to have voices by former committees of elections, but had had their right of voting confirmed to them by the express words of an Act of Parliament and the authority of the whole legislature. There was a string of these equitable determinations in about half a dozen instances, so unwarrantable and indefensible that people grew ashamed of pretending to talk of right and wrong, laughed at that for which they ought to have blushed, and declared that

---

[3] It seems strange that Lord Hervey should sneer at this speech, which seems appropriate to the occasion, and to which *he himself* moved the responsive address, 31st January; but he was probably somewhat out of humour at not having had office.

[4] There were near seventy election petitions this Session.

in elections they never considered the cause, but the men, nor ever voted according to justice and right, but from solicitation and favour. At the same time these honest gentlemen, by an extraordinary and unaccountable casuistry, fancied that, whilst they were every day defrauding people of what they had purchased with so considerable a part of their fortune, that they should have scruples about picking a pocket or robbing on the highway; and flattered themselves that a conscience which could digest the one without hesitation, would have found any argument against the other but the slightness of the temptation or the fear of the punishment.

During this session of Parliament the preliminary articles for a general peace, which had been signed some months before [31st May, 1727] by the Emperor, France, England, and Holland, were agreed to by the Court of Spain. The substance of these articles was, that all hostilities for the space of seven years should cease, and that the traffic of the Ostend Company should be suspended for the same term; that all the articles of the Quadruple Alliance should be observed and adhered to; that all treaties relating to commerce made before the year 1725 should subsist in their full force; that the pacification of the North should be discussed at the Congress; that the English fleet should retire from before Portobello and depart from the Spanish West Indies; and that reparation should be made to the merchants on both sides for damages that had been done and the losses they had sustained. All further disputes and subordinate particulars were to be referred to the plenipotentiaries at the Congress, and to be adjusted there.

The Emperor's having signed these articles without the consent or privity of the Crown of Spain, caused a coolness between these two Courts, and laid the foundation of that breach which was the occasion of all others being healed. Spain, finding that the consideration of her interest, and the provisions made for her in those preliminaries, fell so much short of the hopes she had entertained, and the advantages she had proposed to herself, thought her cause neglected by the Emperor; and that, his own coffers being filled beforehand by the mad liberality of a profuse Queen, he did not trouble himself much about procuring for Spain what those vast sums had been remitted to purchase and secure. These jealousies and disgusts enabled England to treat separately with these two Powers, and made them hearken to terms which, if they had continued united, in all probability they would never have listened to; but the jealousy each of these Crowns had conceived of the other's complying first, and those who stood out last being consequently left alone against all Europe, made each of these Powers as ready to accept of an accommodation as England to propose it.

The indolent, pacific, and tractable disposition of the Cardinal gave England little trouble from that quarter, and left our ministers full liberty to make what advantage they pleased of this conjuncture; which was a lucky accident for us, but no justification of those who threw us so absolutely into their power, and left the arbitration of our fortune entirely in their hands.[5]

The Congress was at first appointed to meet at Aix-

[5] This latter passage seems very obscure. It appears in the MS. to have been added to the original.

la-Chapelle, but Cardinal Fleury, desiring to have the scene of business near to him, and being unable to leave the King, fixed it at Soissons: it was to open in June. Horace Walpole, ambassador in France, Mr. Stanhope, vice-chamberlain to the King, who had been ambassador in Spain, and Mr. Poyntz, an élève of Lord Townshend's, were appointed plenipotentiaries on the part of England.

Before the King put an end to this session of Parliament he desired and insisted upon it to his ministers that they should procure him, by a vote of credit, the same mark of confidence from this House of Commons that his father had so often received from their predecessors. The ministers were not at all inclined to ask this compliment, and the Parliament as little inclined to bestow it; but, notwithstanding the reluctance both of the managers and donors, the thing was done, as unwillingly asked and granted as it was willingly received. I cannot better illustrate the nature of the complaisant trusts reposed in the Crown by these votes of credit than by repeating what was said formerly in one of these debates by Sir Thomas Hanmer,[6] a sensible, impracticable, honest, formal, disagreeable man, whose great merit was loving his country, and whose great weakness loving the parsons. His speeches in Parliament were always fine pieces of oratory, but never of any signification; for, as he was eloquent without persuading, he was admired without being followed, and pleased people's ears without influencing their opinions. With all his sense, what he brought himself to at last,

[6] The editor of Shakespeare. He had been Speaker in Queen Anne's last Parliament. He was a relation and most intimate friend of Lord Bristol.

by a wavering odd conduct, was, to be neither of use to one party nor a terror to the other, and to be disliked at Court, without being beloved in the country.

What he urged against the late practice of Parliament in votes of credit was this:—

"Our ancestors," said he, "had two ways of giving extraordinary sums of money to the Crown on extraordinary occasions: the one was by voting a sum certain, without an account required of the disposal of it; the other was the giving credit to the Crown for an indefinite sum, making the Crown accountable the next year for the use that had been made of this discretionary power, and the manner in which the money had been employed. These were anciently the methods practised by our ancestors; but the modern manner of giving money to the Crown has conciliated both the inconveniences of these two ways, by neither limiting the sum given, nor examining the account of what has been expended."

This was certainly not ill said, and put the conduct of the House of Commons, with regard to that most material branch of all their power, the giving of money, in a light which any one man would have been ashamed to appear in; but when shame comes to be divided among five hundred, the portion of every individual is so small that it hurts their pride as little as it disconcerts their countenances.

As soon as the King had put an end to this session of Parliament, he went to Richmond, as he said, because it was an old acquaintance: he went afterwards to Hampton Court and Windsor, as others said, because they were new acquaintances. He would fain have persuaded both himself and other people that he loved leisure and retirement; but whenever he tried them he was always uneasy and impatient to return to a circle,

and never did retire in order to convince people he liked it, without convincing himself that he did not, and that he was no more turned to live alone agreeably to himself than he was to live in company agreeably to other people.

The Congress was opened this summer at Soissons, but the cooks of the Plenipotentiaries had much more business there than their secretaries, for all the employment of these great national and regal representatives was giving and receiving visits and dinners.[7]

It was this summer, too, that that coolness, which afterwards ended in a total breach, began to show itself between Lord Townshend and Sir Robert Walpole: it was not yet grown to such a height as to be manifest to those moles of a Court who are always drudging on in their own interested little paths without seeing what passes every day around them, but those few alert courtiers who, like cautious and skilful sailors, see every cloud as soon as it rises and watch every wind as fast as it changes, already perceived the signs of this gathering tempest, prepared for its bursting, and began to set their sails in such a manner as should enable them to shift to the gale that was most favourable, and put them in a readiness to pursue the course they were in or tack about, just as the weather should require, and to that point of the compass where sunshine was most likely to appear.

---

[7] It opened on the 14th of June, but, after a few weeks, the principal ministers dispersed, and the meetings became few and irregular, the real negotiations having been transferred for the convenience of Cardinal Fleury to Fontainebleau and Paris. Such of the ministers as, for form's sake, remained at Soissons, continued to give entertainments, to which Lord Hervey alludes, till the middle of October, when the farce seems to have ended.

Posterity will certainly be curious to learn what extraordinary cause there could be for this rupture between two men who, joined to the alliance of brotherhood, had for thirty years together lived in an uninterrupted intimacy of the strictest friendship. But those who knew his lordship's impracticable temper would rather wonder that this union continued so long, than that it was at last dissolved. No man was ever a greater slave to his passions than Lord Townshend; few had ever less judgment to poise his passions; none ever listened less to that little they had. He was rash in his undertakings, violent in his proceedings, haughty in his carriage, brutal in his expressions, and cruel in his disposition; impatient of the least contradiction, and as slow to pardon as he was quick to resent. He was so captious that he would often take offence where nobody meant to give it; and, when he had done so, was too obstinate in such jealousies, though never so lightly founded, to see his error, and too implacable ever to forgive those against whom they were conceived. He was much more tenacious of his opinion than of his word; for the one he never gave up, and the other he seldom kept; anybody could get promises from him, but few could prevail with him to perform them. It was as difficult to make him just as to make him reasonable; and as hard to obtain anything of him as to convince him. He was blunt without being severe, and false without being artful; for when he designed to be most so, he endeavoured to temper the natural insolence of his behaviour with an affected affability, which sat so ill upon him that the insinuating grin he wore upon those occasions was more formidable than his

severest frown; and would put anybody to whom he pretended friendship more upon their guard than those to whom he professed enmity.

He had been so long in business, that, notwithstanding his slow, blundering capacity, he might have got through the routine of his employment if he had not thought himself as much above that part of a statesman as all mankind thought any other above him. He loved deep schemes and extensive projects, and affected to strike what is commonly called great strokes in politics —things which, considering the nature of our government, a wise minister would be as incapable of concerting, without the utmost necessity, as Lord Townshend would have been of executing them, if there was a necessity. He had been the most frequent speaker in the House of Lords for many years, and was as little improved as if there had been no room for it. Those who were most partial to him (or rather, those who pretended to be so whilst he was in power) would not deny that he talked ill, but used to say he undertalked his capacity, that his conception was much superior to his utterance, and that he made a much better figure in private deliberations than in public debates. But when he lost his interest at Court, he lost these palliatives for his dullness in the world, and people were as ready then to give up his understanding as they had formerly been to give up his oratory. He either conferred fewer obligations or met with more ingratitude than any man that ever had been so long at the top of an administration, for when he retired he went alone, and as universally unregretted as unattended. These Memoirs are such a medley, that nothing can properly be called

foreign to them; and for that reason I shall here insert a little epigram on Lord Townshend's disgrace:—

"With such a head and such a heart,
If Fortune fails to take thy part,
And long continues thus unkind,
She must be deaf as well as blind;
And quite reversing every rule,
Nor see the knave, nor hear the fool."

I believe the first dispute between Lord Townshend and Sir Robert Walpole began upon making the Treaty of Hanover, which Sir Robert Walpole always disapproved, and would have prevented, though he was forced, when the measure was once taken, either to maintain it or break entirely with Lord Townshend—a rupture which at that time would probably have ended in his own disgrace; though, in the subsequent reign, it terminated in Lord Townshend's; for Sir Robert's power then subsisted as much upon Lord Townshend's superior favour at Court as Lord Townshend's success subsisted by Sir Robert's superior capacity. Sir Robert Walpole's great objection to this treaty was its throwing us so entirely into the arms of France, who naturally could never be long or cordially our friends, and its putting us so absolutely into her power if she pleased to be a dangerous enemy. Another objection to it was, that it engaged us in all the expenses of a war at the same time that it put us in no possibility of expecting any of those advantages that were to be reaped from one, and kept us in all the inaction of peace without the benefit of tranquillity. Thus the real situation in which this treaty put England indisputably was, declaring ourselves enemies to those Powers who might be our friends, and engaging in alliance with one that never could. It put us to all the charge necessary

to defend our possessions abroad, and yet left them open to the discussion of future treaties; and was just such a degree of warfare as provoked Spain to molest us in our commerce, without going far enough to enable us to do ourselves justice by reprisals. Till the making of this treaty Sir Robert Walpole never meddled at all with foreign affairs; they were left entirely to Lord Townshend, whilst Sir Robert's province was confined solely to parliamentary and domestic concerns. But when Sir Robert found the clamour against this treaty so great at home, and the difficulties so many in which it entangled us abroad, he began to think it necessary to take some cognizance of what gave him immediately more trouble than all his own affairs put together. For though Lord Townshend only was the transactor of these peace and war negotiations, yet the labouring oar in their consequences always fell on Sir Robert; it was he was forced to stand the attacks of parliamentary inquiry into the prudence of making these treaties; it was he was to provide the means necessary to support them; on him only fell the censure of entering into them, and on him lay all the difficulty of getting out of them.

I shall not digress farther on the first heart-burnings between these two friends and brothers in the late reign, having said enough to show how unavoidable it was for Sir Robert Walpole on this occasion to disgust Lord Townshend in the two material points of not approving what had been done, and daring for the future to offer his advice in what was to be done.

Another great mortification to Lord Townshend's pride was the seeing and feeling every day that Sir Robert Walpole, who came into the world, in a manner, under

his protection, and inferior to him in fortune, quality, and credit, was now, by the force of his infinitely superior talents, as much above him in power, interest, weight, credit, and reputation. All application was made to him; his house was crowded like a fair with all sorts of petitioners, whilst Lord Townshend's was only frequented by the narrow set of a few relations and particular flatterers; and as Lord Townshend in the late reign had nothing but personal favour at Court to depend upon in any disputes that might arise between him and Sir Robert, he could not but grieve to find that resource in the new reign entirely taken away, the scene quite inverted, and himself as much dependent now upon Sir Robert's personal interest as Sir Robert had formerly been upon his: for as the Duchess of Kendal never loved Sir Robert Walpole, and was weak enough to admire and be fond of Lord Townshend, so in any nice points that were to be insinuated gently and carried by favour in the last reign, the canal of application to the royal ear had always been from Lord Townshend to the Duchess and from the Duchess to the King; whereas now everything that passed to the present King through the Queen (who was to the son at least what the Duchess of Kendal had been to the father) was suggested by Sir Robert, and nothing pushed or received by her from any other hand.

In enumerating the seeds of Lord Townshend's disgust to Sir Robert Walpole there is another occurs to me, which, trivial as it may seem, I cannot help mentioning, because I firmly believe it was a circumstance that operated so powerfully on the weak brain and strong vanity of this great and noble Lord, that it con-

tributed more than all the rest put together to settle these little jealousies and distastes into a fixed insurmountable aversion.

What I mean is, the great house which Sir Robert Walpole built at Houghton, in Lord Townshend's neighbourhood in Norfolk; and though it may seem to some too ridiculous and inconsiderable a mouse to have put this ministerial mountain in labour, yet those who fancy the passions of princes, the quarrels of heroes, and wrangles of great men are not often at first stirred by as mean engines and lighted by as small sparks as the dissensions of their most obscure inferiors, must have been little conversant with such people, or conversed with them (if knowing them be the end of conversing with them) to very little purpose.

Before Sir Robert Walpole built this house (which was one of the best, though not of the largest, in England) Lord Townshend looked upon his own seat at Raynham as the metropolis of Norfolk, was proud of the superiority, and considered every stone that augmented the splendour of Houghton as a diminution of the grandeur of Raynham. Had Sir Robert Walpole raised this fabric of fraternal discord in any other county in England, it might have escaped the envy of this wise rival; but Sir Robert's partiality to the *solum natale*, the scene of his youth and the abode of his ancestors, made that neighbourhood, to which the accidental commencement of his friendship with Lord Townshend was first owing, the cause also of its dissolution.

As the misunderstanding between these two ministers increased, Lord Townshend began to think of forming

a separate party at Court, and attaching some particular people to himself whom he could look upon as his personal friends, who should go under the denomination of *Townshend's men*, and on whom he might depend in case these dissensions should come to a total breach.

Among these was Lord Trevor,[8] then Privy Seal, and afterwards President of the Council, an able man in his way and bred to the law. He had been employed by the Tory ministry at the end of Queen Anne's reign, and was by principle (if he had any principle) a Jacobite. However, from interest and policy, he became, like his brother-convert and brother-lawyer, Lord Harcourt, as zealous a servant to the Hanover family as any of those who had never been otherwise; for as these two men were too knowing in their trade to swerve from the established principles of their profession, they acted like most lawyers, who generally look on princes like other clients, and, without any regard to right or wrong—the equity or injustice of the cause—think themselves obliged to maintain whoever fees them last and pays them best.

There was an occurrence at the latter end of this summer at Windsor relating to the court Lord Townshend then made to Lord Trevor, which I shall relate, because I think it will give a short but strong sketch both of Lord Townshend's and Sir Robert Walpole's temper; but before I begin my relation I must pre-

[8] Thomas first Lord Trevor, Solicitor-General in 1692, Attorney in 1695, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas in 1701, Privy Seal in 1725, and President of the Council in 1730. Lord Harcourt had been Lord Chancellor in Queen Anne's Tory ministry.

mise that Sir Robert Walpole at this time kept a very pretty young woman, daughter to a merchant, whose name was Skerrett, and for whom he was said to have given (besides an annual allowance) 5000*l.* as entrance-money.[9]

One evening at Windsor the Queen asking Sir Robert Walpole and Lord Townshend where they had dined that day, the latter said he had dined at home with Lord and Lady Trevor;[10] upon which Sir Robert Walpole said to Her Majesty, smiling, "My Lord,

---

[9] Maria Skerrett was, however, a young lady of more distinction than Lord Hervey's statement would seem to indicate. She was a familiar friend of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, the second of whose celebrated letters (5th August, 1716) was addressed to her; and we find her mentioned subsequently:—

"*Twickenham*, 1725,—*Miss Skerrit is in the house with me.*"

"*Cavendish Square*, 1725,—*Miss Skerrit stayed all the remainder of the summer with me, and we are now come to town.*"

And again—

"*I see everybody, but converse with nobody but* des amis choisis; *in the first rank of these are Lady Stafford and dear Molly Skerrit.*"

It is stated in a note to Lady Mary's Letters that "she was maid of honour to the Queen." This seems hardly consistent with the terms in which we find the Queen speaking of her, and I have not been able to trace her name in any of the lists of the household. Sir Robert married her in February or March, 1738, in six or seven months after his first wife's death; and it is stated in the periodicals of the day that she had "80,000*l.* fortune." If this was not either a sneer or a blind, it would seem to contradict the additional scandal, that Sir Robert had *bought* her. She died in three months after her marriage, leaving an only daughter, born long before, and for whom Sir Robert, when created a peer, obtained the rank of an Earl's daughter, and she married a natural son of General Churchill, mentioned *ante*, p. 23. The whole affair, which seems to our present notion almost incredibly scandalous, gave peculiar poignancy to the satire of the 'Beggars' Opera,' where Macheath, Lucy, and Polly reminded the public of Walpole, his lady, and "Molly Skerrett."

[10] Lord Trevor was now 70 years old, and his wife, Anne Weldon, was probably not much less. She had been a widow before her marriage with Lord Trevor, and her eldest son by him was now 27 years of age. So that Sir Robert's pleasantry would have been very innocent if it had not been embittered by the political sneer.

Madam, I think is grown *coquet* from a long widowhood, and has some design upon my Lady Trevor's virtue, for his assiduity of late in that family is grown to be so much more than common civility, that without this solution I know not how to account for it." What made this raillery of Sir Robert Walpole's very excusable and impossible to shock my Lord's prudery, let him pique himself ever so much on the chastity of his character, was, that my good Lady Trevor, besides her strict life and conversation, was of the most virtuous forbidding countenance that natural ugliness, age, and small-pox ever compounded. However, Lord Townshend, affecting to take the reproach literally, and to understand what Sir Robert meant to insinuate of the political court he paid to the husband as sensual designs upon the wife, with great warmth replied, "No, Sir, I am not one of those fine gentlemen who find no time of life, nor any station in the world, preservatives against follies and immoralities that are hardly excusable when youth and idleness make us most liable to such temptations. They are liberties, Sir, which I can assure you I am as far from taking as from approving; nor have I either a constitution that requires such practices, a purse that can support them, or a conscience that can digest them." Whilst he uttered these words his voice trembled, his countenance was pale, and every limb shook with passion. But Sir Robert Walpole, always master of his temper, made him no other answer than asking him with a smile, and in a very mild tone of voice, "What, my Lord, all this for my Lady Trevor?"

The Queen grew uneasy, and, to prevent Lord

rien ne vit que par le détail. S-B.

Townshend's replying or the thing being pushed any farther, only laughed, and began immediately to talk on some other subject.[11]

If I am thought to be too particular in relating little circumstances of this kind, all I can say for myself is, that I have no guide to guess at what will please other people in reading these papers but what I find pleases myself best in works of the like nature; and one good authority, I am sure, I have for believing these sort of incidents are generally not disagreeable, because Machiavel, I remember, in the proem to his History of Florence, speaking of such little particulars, says:—

" Se niuna cosa diletta o insigna nella historia, è quella che particolarmente si discrivi; se niuna lettione e utile a quelli chi governano le republiche, è quella che dimostra la cagioni de gli odii e delle divisioni; accioche possano, con il pericolo d' altri diventati savi, mantenersi uniti; e se ogni essempio di

[11] It is odd that Lord Hervey should not allude (if it had ever happened) to the much more remarkable altercation and *personal scuffle* between Walpole and Townshend, said to have occurred at Mrs. Selwyn's, in Cleveland Court, and supposed to have been the original of the celebrated quarrel scene between Peachem and Lockit in the 'Beggars' Opera.' Coxe, who (as far as I know) first told the story, does not *specify* his authority, and dates it in 1729. Lord Mahon repeats it, but assigns no authority, and places it under the date of 1730, just before Townshend's resignation. This would seem the more probable, as after such a scene it is hard to imagine the parties could have continued to sit in the same cabinet; but as the 'Beggars' Opera' was played on the 29th January, 1728, it is certain either that the date of the historians is an anachronism, or that Gay alluded to some earlier dispute, or that the story was made from the scene.

I must here observe that the first appearance of the 'Beggars' Opera' has been commonly placed in November, 1727, and on what looks like conclusive authority,—a letter of Swift's to Gay, dated 27th November, which talks of the opera as then both played and printed: but this letter will be seen, on close examination, to be a fusion of two letters—one written in November, 1727, and the second three months later; or the Dean may have kept the letter three months before he finished it. This difficulty is not noticed by any of the editors.

republica muove, quelli che si leggono della propria, muovono molto più, e molto più sono utili."

"If there is anything in history which either delights or instructs, it is particular description. If anything be useful to those citizens who have the government of the commonwealth in their hands, it is that which represents the causes of former feuds and dissensions, that they may become wise at other people's expense and keep themselves united; and if examples from other countries make an impression on the reader, certainly those drawn from his own country must affect him much stronger and be much more useful."

CHAPTER VI.

Complaints against Spain—The Beggars' Opera—Duchess of Queensberry forbidden the Court—Deficiency in the Civil List—Sir Paul Methuen—Dispute between George II. and the King of Prussia—Royal duel—Lord Hervey's return from Italy—His political position—Breaks with Mr. Pulteney—Treaty of Seville—Debate on the Hessian Troops—Debate on Dunkirk, and Lord Hervey's Pamphlet—Townshend resigns—Lord Hervey Vice-Chamberlain.

WHEN the Parliament met this year [21*st January*] the affairs of Europe were as unsettled as ever, so that the same complaints were continued by the Opposition, and the same defence made by the Administration; that is, the opponents and malcontents complained that our peace was imperfect, and the ministers insisted that the most imperfect peace was better than a certain war. The complaints of the merchants, however, upon the interruption they everywhere met with in their trade, and particularly upon the depredations of the Spaniards in the West Indies, were so loud and so numerous, that it was impossible for the ministers to prevent them stating their grievances to the Parliament and asking that redress from them which they had in vain solicited at Court.

The ministers and their party in Parliament were imprudent enough, when the affair came to be examined there, to seem to take the part of the Spaniards against our own merchants, and to endeavour to soften the injustice of the one and to lessen the losses of the other. This conduct was very unpopular without doors, but

the ministers carried their point within, and prevented the Parliament from coming to any vigorous resolutions of ordering reprisals, or from doing anything more than making a general address to the King to recommend the merchants and the trade of his kingdom to his care and protection.

It was in this winter, just before the Parliament met, that the King was prevailed upon to send for his son from Hanover. His ministers told him that if the Prince's coming were longer delayed, an address from Parliament and the voice of the whole nation would certainly oblige his Majesty to send for him, and consequently he would be necessitated to do that with a bad grace which he might now do with a good one.[1]

* * * *

Among the remarkable occurrences of this winter I cannot help relating that of the Duchess of Queensberry being forbid the Court, and the occasion of it. One Gay, a poet, had written a ballad opera, which was thought to reflect a little upon the Court, and a good deal upon the Minister.[2] It was called the 'Beggars' Opera,' had a prodigious run, and was so extremely pretty in its kind, that even those who were most glanced at in the satire had prudence enough to

[1] Prince Frederick (born in 1707) arrived in England on the 4th of December, 1728, and was soon after created Prince of Wales, and sworn of the Privy Council. Some pages of the MS. are here wanting.

[2] There can be no doubt of this; but we know, from Gay's letter to Swift, 22nd October, 1727, that his opera had been *finished* before his disappointment from and final breach with Walpole and the Court. There was of course time enough between this disappointment and the representation of the piece to add some satiric touches against the minister; it would else be inconceivable that Gay should have written such a piece while he was soliciting and expecting a place at Court.

disguise their resentment by chiming in with the universal applause with which it was performed. Gay, who had attached himself to Mrs. Howard, and been disappointed of preferment at Court, finding this couched satire upon those to whom he imputed his disappointment succeed so well, wrote a second part to this opera, less pretty, but more abusive, and so little disguised, that Sir Robert Walpole resolved, rather than suffer himself to be produced for thirty nights together upon the stage in the person of a highwayman, to make use of his friend the Duke of Grafton's authority as Lord Chamberlain to put a stop to the representation of it.[3] Accordingly this *Theatrical Craftsman* was prohibited at every playhouse. Gay, irritated at this bar thrown in the way both of his interest and his revenge, zested the work with some supplemental invectives, and resolved to print it by subscription. The Duchess of Queensberry[4] set herself at the head of this undertaking, and solicited every mortal that came in her way, or in whose way she could put herself, to subscribe. To a woman of her quality, proverbially

---

[3] I am at a loss to account for this statement, which, though it accords with that generally received, seems to me wholly erroneous. 'Polly' is very stupid, and equally inoffensive: the scene is placed in the West Indies, where Macheath, under the name of *Morano*, becomes a Spanish pirate, appears but little on the scene, and is hanged; while *Polly*, after being kidnapped and sold as a slave, marries an Indian Prince. The piece seems to me to be as free from all political allusion as it is destitute of any kind of dramatic merit. Lord Hervey's description applies to the '*Beggars' Opera*' itself, but not at all to '*Polly*.' Nor can I understand why the latter should have been prohibited, except to punish the author for his former sallies. Gay, in a preface, asserts that he had no satirical design, and certainly the printed piece justifies his statement.

[4] Lady Catherine Hyde, granddaughter of Lord Chancellor Clarendon, a lady of great beauty and eccentricity, who retained some traces of the former, and strong symptoms of the latter, to her death in 1777.

beautiful, and at the top of the polite and fashionable world, people were ashamed to refuse a guinea, though they were afraid to give it. Her solicitations were so universal and so pressing, that she came even into the Queen's apartment, went round the Drawing-room, and made even the King's servants contribute to the printing of a thing which the King had forbid being acted. The King, when he came into the Drawing-room, seeing her Grace very busy in a corner with three or four men, asked her what she had been doing. She answered, "*What* must be agreeable, she was sure, to anybody so humane as his Majesty, for it was an act of charity, and a charity to which she did not despair of bringing his Majesty to contribute." Enough was said for each to understand the other, and though the King did not then (as the Duchess of Queensberry reported) appear at all angry, yet this proceeding of her Grace's, when talked over in private between his Majesty and the Queen, was so resented, that Mr. Stanhope, then Vice-Chamberlain to the King, was sent in form to the Duchess of Queensberry to desire her to forbear coming to Court; his message was verbal. Her answer, for fear of mistakes, she desired to send in writing, wrote it on the spot, and this is the literal copy:—

"Feb. 27, 1728-9.

"That the Duchess of Queensberry is surprised and well pleased that the King hath given her so agreeable a command as to stay from Court, where she never came for diversion, but to bestow a great civility on the King and Queen; she hopes by such an unprecedented order as this is, that the King will see as few as he wishes at his Court, particularly such as dare to think or speak truth. I dare not do otherwise, and ought not nor could have imagined that it would not have been the

very highest compliment that I could possibly pay the King to endeavour to support truth and innocence in his house, particularly when the King and Queen both told me that they had not read Mr. Gay's play. I have certainly done right, then, to stand by my own words rather than his Grace of Grafton's, who hath neither made use of truth, judgment, nor honour, through this whole affair, either for himself or his friends.

"C. QUEENSBERRY."

When her Grace had finished this paper, drawn with more spirit than accuracy, she gave it to Mr. Stanhope, who desired her to think again, asked pardon for being so impertinent as to offer her any advice, but begged she would give him leave to carry an answer less rough than that she had put into his hands. Upon this she wrote another, but so much more disrespectful, that he desired the first again and delivered it.

Most people blamed the Court upon this occasion. What the Duchess of Queensberry did was certainly impertinent; but the manner of resenting it was thought impolitic. The Duke of Queensberry laid down his employment of Admiral of Scotland upon it, though very much and very kindly pressed by the King to remain in his service.

This employment some time after was given to Lord Stair upon his writing the most submissive and supplicating letter to Sir Robert Walpole, setting forth the convenience it would be to his distressed, broken fortune, desiring Sir Robert's good nature to draw a veil over all that was past, and giving the strongest assurances of his future good behaviour.

Towards the end of this session of Parliament [*23rd April*] was made that most unpopular and famous

demand of the 115,000*l.*, to make good the pretended deficiency in the Civil List funds, which, by an unfair way of calculating and stating the accounts, as well as a forced construction of the Act of Parliament, were said to have fallen so much short of 800,000*l.* a-year, designed at all hazards to be secured to his Majesty when the Civil List was settled.

The truth of the matter was, that in the first place there was not the deficiency, and in the next, if there had been, it was doubtful by the wording of the Act whether the Parliament was obliged to make it up, and whether these funds had not been given to the King at his own desire in the beginning of his reign, not as a sum certain, but for better for worse, for more or for less. Sir Robert Walpole always denied the having advised this demand, and scrupled not to excuse himself to his friends by saying he had opposed it so long and so strenuously, that the King had intimated to him, if he could not or would not do it, his Majesty would find those who were both able and willing. Sir Robert Walpole always said it was Lord Wilmington who had put the King upon this measure, with the double view of making his own court and prejudicing Sir Robert Walpole; his Lordship knowing that he should have the merit to the King of forming this project, and Sir Robert the demerit first of opposing it, and then all the trouble and unpopularity of bringing it to bear. But this conjecture, I believe, was doing Lord Wilmington's dexterity too much honour; his views were never so extended or so complicated; they were generally more simple, and his reasoning, I dare say, went no farther than this: "*The King loves money, and will*

love me if I tell him how he may get some." In short, got it was, but with great difficulty and great clamour [by a majority of 214 to 104], no one body who voted for it thinking it a proper grant or a reasonable demand.

His Royal Highness [Prince Frederick], who began to hate his father very heartily and not very secretly,[5] was extremely flippant in his comments on this measure, and, though he would have done the same thing in the same situation, pretended to disapprove entirely his father's conduct on this occasion; by which means he contrived to be doubly in the wrong—in the first place, for saying what he ought only to have thought, and, in the next, for not thinking what he ought not to have said.

The end of this Session was remarkable only for one change, which was Sir Paul Methuen's quitting the employment of Treasurer of the Household. His pretence for quitting was disliking the conduct of the Court in general; but his true reason was his disapprobation, not of any actual sin, but their sin of omission in not making him Secretary of State, an employment he had once unaccountably in the late reign obtained,[6] and quitted when Lord Townshend and Sir

---

[5] Horace Walpole remarks, that the dissension between father and son is remarkable in the *House of Hanover*. The fact of the dissension is undeniable, but it arises, I think, not from any peculiarity in that family, but from the nature of a representative constitution, which generates *parties*, and, if one party has the confidence of the King, the other endeavours, and generally succeeds, in captivating the favour of the heir-apparent.

[6] He became Secretary of State in the absence of Mr. Stanhope, under the first Townshend-and-Walpole ministry, in June, 1716, and went out with them in April, 1717; and in 1725 returned to office as Treasurer of

Robert Walpole were disgraced. The character of this man was a very singular one: it was a mixture of Spanish formality and English roughness, strongly seasoned with pride, and not untinctured with honour. He was romantic in his turn to the highest degree of absurdity; odd, impracticable, passionate, and obstinate; a thorough coxcomb, and a little mad. As to the affair of party, he called himself always a Whig; after he had quitted he went too often to Court to be well with the Opposition, and too seldom to Parliament to be well with either side—a conduct which procured him the agreeable mixed character of courtier without profit, and a country gentleman without popularity.

This summer [17*th May*] the King went to Hanover for the first time, to take possession there and settle his affairs. He left the Queen Regent, which his son took extremely ill.[7] Lord Townshend went with the King to Hanover, and gained a little ground there, which he soon lost again at his return; Sir Robert Walpole and he being irreconcilable, and the first trying to support himself by the Queen, the other by the King.

It was said, but not truly, though generally believed, that the Queen's powers as Regent were abridged by orders sent from the King as soon as he got into Holland, at the instigation of Lord Townshend.

---

the Household. He was the son of Mr. Methuen, who had been long minister in Portugal, and negotiated the famous treaty that went by his name.

[7] George II., when Prince, had been, on his father's *first* visit to Germany, left Regent; but then George I. had no queen. We know nothing of what offence might have been given or taken on that occasion, but the Prince was never after appointed Regent; and he himself never appointed his own son.

Whilst the King was at Hanover he had several little German disputes with his brother of Prussia,[8] the particulars of which being about a few cart-loads of hay, a mill, and some soldiers improperly enlisted by the King of Prussia in the Hanoverian state, I do not think them worthy of being considered in detail; and shall say nothing further about these squabbles than that, first or last, both of them contrived to be in the wrong. And as these two princes had some similar impracticabilities in their temper, so they were too much alike ever to agree, and from this time forward hated one another with equal imprudence, inveteracy, and openness.

It was reported, and I believe not without foundation, that our Monarch on this occasion sent or would have sent a challenge of single combat to his Prussian Majesty; but whether it was carried and rejected, or whether the prayers and remonstrances of Lord Townshend prevented the gauntlet being actually thrown down, is a point which to me at least has never been cleared.

There was another subject of dispute between the Kings of England and Prussia, which I forgot to enumerate, though it was the only one really of consequence, and that was with regard to the affairs of Mecklenburg. The short statement of their differences on this article was, whether the Prussian or Hanoverian troops (both ordered into Mecklenburg by a decree of the Aulic Council) should have the greatest share (under the pretence of keeping peace) in plundering the people and completing the ruin of that miserable duchy, already

[8] The King of Prussia had married, 14th November, 1706, Dorothea Sophia, the only daughter of George I. Between him and George II. there was almost Theban enmity.

reduced to such a state of calamity by the tyrannical conduct of their most abominable, deposed, or rather suspended duke.

Just after the King's return from Hanover [11*th Sept.*], Lord Hervey, after having been abroad a year and a half for his health, returned from Italy.[9] He loved Mr. Pulteney, and had obligations to Sir Robert Walpole; he had lived in long intimacy and personal friendship with the former, and in his public and political conduct he always attached himself to the latter. But as the dissensions of these two men were now grown to such a height that it was impossible for anybody to live well with both, Lord Hervey at his return found he should be brought to the long-feared disagreeable necessity of quitting the one or the other.

His wife loved Mr. Pulteney and hated Sir Robert Walpole. Sir Robert had formerly made love to her, but unsuccessfully,[10] which had produced the mutual enmity generally consequential on such circumstances—love in these cases being like a ball, which the greater strength it comes with, if it meets with resistance the farther it rebounds back from the point at which it was aimed. Sir Robert Walpole, therefore, detested Lady Hervey and Lady Hervey him. So that all her interest in her husband was employed to draw him off from Sir Robert Walpole, and attach himself to Mr. Pulteney; and as she knew her husband's affection to Mr. Pulteney,

---

[9] He must then have set out very soon after moving the address in January, 1728.

[10] I cannot refrain from noticing this expression; which, considering the position of all the parties, and the exemplary character of Lady Hervey, seems to me strangely tame and *nonchalant*.

she was certain nothing but the weight of interest could turn the scale in this contest on the side of Sir Robert Walpole.

In order, therefore, to lighten the balance of interest, or rather to counterbalance it, Pulteney and she together had formed a scheme, before Lord Hervey came over, to induce Lord Bristol[11] to make his son such an allowance as should indemnify him for throwing up a pension of 1000*l.* a-year, which he now received from the Court.

This project, by the joint endeavours of Pulteney and the dowager Duchess of Marlborough, who would have done anything to gain him over from the Court,[12] * * [at last so far succeeded, that Lord Hervey wrote to Sir Robert Walpole a letter, in which, after some introductory matter, he said],—

"You know the situation of my affairs and my opinion so well, that it is unnecessary for me to say, notwithstanding the King's favour must be very convenient to me in one sense, yet the receiving no mark of it but in the manner I have formerly done is what I must decline.

"All I have at present therefore, Sir, to beg of you is, that you would have the goodness to assure the King of the gratitude with which I think of his goodness towards me; that I received what he bestowed upon me with double satisfaction, as I imagined it an earnest (in case I lived) of some future

[11] Lord Bristol was extremely generous in such matters. When Lord Hervey was finally turned out in 1742, he was offered a pension of 3000*l.*, which he rejected, so much to the satisfaction and pride of Lord Bristol, that he immediately increased Lord Hervey's already liberal income by that sum.

[12] Here a sheet of the MS. is unfortunately lost: it evidently detailed the proceedings of Lady Hervey, the Duchess, and Pulteney, to separate Lord Hervey from Sir Robert Walpole—circumstances very important to his personal history, and which produced the resignation of his pension and his letter to Walpole.

mark of his distinction, and was not insensible to that part of the obligation of its being conferred at a time when I was incapable of deserving it by any present services, and so unlikely to repay it by any future ones. But as I am now capable of attending in Parliament,[13] and that those who either speak or vote there under my circumstances are exposed to disagreeable insinuations and reflections upon one's conduct from malicious and envious blockheads, who perhaps could find no other answer to one's arguments; so I must entreat the King, whenever he shall think proper, to consider me in some manner which I shall not be ashamed to own, and in the mean time to give me leave to serve him without those inducements that must take off the merit of those little services towards him, that make them liable to be misconstrued by the rest of the world, and consequently less cheerfully performed by myself.

"I know the King's reception of this message will depend so entirely on the person who conveys it, and the manner of its being represented, that I feel a security (from the repeated marks and professions of your friendship for me) in its going through your hands, which no other method of delivering it could give me.

"I am persuaded you will assure him (notwithstanding what is reported[14]) that my taking this step proceeds from no ill humour, distaste, or coolness to his service, and that my future conduct will be a proof how ill such reports are founded.

"I am convinced, too, that you think what I am doing right, as it will set my character in a better light towards him and towards the world, as it will exempt my conduct from all impertinent reflections upon it, set my own mind more at ease, and permit me on all occasions with less constraint to show myself, "Dear Sir,

"Your most obedient, &c.

"HERVEY."

---

[13] Lord Hervey had been in Parliament for Bury since March, 1725, but it does not appear that he ever spoke, except in moving the address in January, 1728.

[14] An allusion no doubt to rumours of his communications with Pulteney.

This letter was far from pleasing either Sir Robert or Mr. Pulteney; the first looked upon it as a gentle preface to forsaking his service, the other as a bond for continuing in it;[15] especially as Lord Hervey, at the same time he told Mr. Pulteney of this letter, thanked him for the trouble he had given himself in the negotiation with his father, but said the same desire of being at his liberty that had made him throw up his pension, must prevent, too, his acceptance of his father's allowance, since the conditions were his immediately opposing the measures of the Court in Parliament.

From this time the friendship between Lord Hervey and Mr. Pulteney began to cool, and soon after turned into the other extreme; but Lord Hervey, on his return out of the country, finding Sir Robert Walpole, upon the step he had taken, suspected his defection, assured him he would take the first opportunity on the meeting of the Parliament publicly to demonstrate himself as much attached to his interest as ever.

Before the Parliament met [13*th January*, 1703], Sir Robert Walpole had the skill to contrive and the good fortune to conclude a treaty with Spain, which extremely facilitated the business of the Court this year in Parliament, strengthened the power and credit of Sir Robert both in the one and the other, and revived the spirits of all his friends, followers, and adherents.

This treaty, called the Treaty of Seville (from the Court of Spain residing there when it was made), was

[15] And so it seems. It plainly says, that if Lord Hervey does not get some agreeable office he will go into Opposition—which would of course displease Walpole; but that if he should, he will join the Administration—which of course would displease Pulteney.

negotiated by Mr. Vice-Chamberlain Stanhope,[16] then Ambassador and Plenipotentiary in Spain from this Court, and concluded November 8, N.S. 1729. The plan of this treaty was Sir Robert Walpole's, and the substance of it absolute peace between the three Crowns of France, Spain, and England; reciprocal guarantee of their respective possessions, all former treaties of commerce to be again in force, reparations to be made to the merchants of England for captures, seizures, injuries, depredations, &c.; and this account to be settled within the space of three years by commissioners appointed for that purpose. But the principal article that induced the Court of Spain to come into this treaty was, the exchanging the six thousand neutral troops, who, by the Quadruple Alliance, were to secure the eventual succession of Don Carlos to the states of Tuscany, Parma, and Placentia, into six thousand Spaniards, who were forthwith to be introduced into Italy, to garrison Leghorn, Porto-ferraio, Parma, and Placentia, in the same manner that by the Quadruple Alliance these places were to be garrisoned by the neutral Swiss troops.

Immediately upon the conclusion of this treaty, the standing forces in England were reduced above five thousand men, but not in the manner that gave satisfaction any more than the number; the latter not being thought sufficient, and no corps being broken, but the whole reduction made by lessening the number of private men in different regiments.

However, the treaty and the reduction were both mightily bragged of by the Court, and even from the

[16] Afterwards Lord Harrington, of whom we shall see much more in the sequel.

Throne itself at the opening of the subsequent Session; and notwithstanding the various objections made to this treaty, considering all things, it was certainly a very advantageous treaty for England, as it revived our declining trade, put a stop to all the inconveniences complained of in the West Indies, and an end to all pretensions to Gibraltar, notwithstanding that place was only virtually included and not specifically mentioned in the treaty. Nor indeed would it have been possible to have obtained this peace with Spain, had it not been for the Queen of Spain's having nothing at heart but the security of her son's succession in Italy, and being ready to grant any terms, provided England and France would consent immediately to the introduction of the Spanish troops. She saw all her golden dreams of grandeur from the Vienna Treaty vanished, was exasperated to the last degree at the shuffling conduct of the Emperor, and resolved therefore, if possible, to secure the only thing which she found was now attainable for her son.

When this treaty came under consideration in Parliament, it was objected, first, that this exchange of neutral for Spanish troops was an absolute violation of the Quadruple Alliance, and so derogatory to the honour and interest of the Emperor, that it was impossible for him ever to acquiesce under it, and consequently that this boasted peace was nothing more than the herald of a war.

In the next place it was said, that sufficient care had not been taken of the merchants, and that the quiet possession of Gibraltar was not fully secured, for want of a specific resignation of it in the treaty.

To the first of these objections it was answered, that the variation from the Quadruple Alliance was only more

effectually to secure that to Don Carlos which was designed for him by the Quadruple Alliance; consequently, that this treaty was conformable to the spirit if not to the letter of the other; that it would prevent the further suspension of the execution of that article of the Quadruple Alliance which had been so many years, unjustly to Spain, delayed by the Emperor; that it would save England the third part of the expense of the neutral troops which, by the former treaty, she was bound to bear; and that as for the Emperor's refusing to acquiesce under this disposition, all the great Powers in Europe resolving to execute it, the Emperor must know his opposition to it would be vain—consequently, he would certainly not think of making any. It was further said, that as all treaties must be founded on reciprocal advantages to the contracting parties, so it was not to be imagined Spain, out of mere love to England, would renounce her pretensions to Gibraltar, restore us the long interrupted advantages of our commerce, and promise reparation for the losses of our merchants, without some benefit proposed to herself in return; and as that benefit was nothing more than the confirmation of that which she had already a right to, the King of England must have been very ill-advised if he had demurred one moment upon the acceptance of those conditions.

To the objection that sufficient care had not been taken of the merchants, it was answered, that all the care was taken that the nature of such a transaction would admit; that the accounts of the losses were to be stated, the adjustment of them to be referred to commissaries, and that it would have been the highest imprudence to have deferred the signing of this treaty and

deprived ourselves of all the intermediate advantages of it till this affair could have been terminated, which everybody knows must be a work of time.

As to Gibraltar, it was said that though Gibraltar was not particularly named, yet there could not be the least room to dispute its being included in this treaty; and if there was any little delicacy in the Spanish Court from a point of honour, that might make them shy of naming it, yet if England could effectually and securely get the thing she wanted, sure it would not be very justifiable to have refused it, merely on a cavil upon the words by which it was granted and consigned.

Upon the whole, after many proposals made in the House of Lords to cast censure on the Treaty of Seville, which were all rejected, it was voted beneficial, safe, and honourable. In the House of Commons, though often incidentally mentioned, no vote ever passed in its favour or condemnation.

There was another thing strongly urged for the honour of the King in making this treaty, and in contradiction to the insinuations frequently made of his acting on all occasions more as Elector of Hanover than King of England; and this was, that when, by the division of the Courts of Vienna and Spain, it was in the King's power to come to accommodation with which of the two he pleased, it was very evident that he chose to make up with the Power whose friendship was most beneficial to England, and as evident that if he had considered himself as Elector of Hanover only, he would certainly have made his first overtures of reconciliation to the Emperor, and not have taken a step to irritate him further.

When the debate of the Hessians came on [*14th February*], everything Pulteney had said to Lord Hervey[17] was insinuated, but much more gently than he had suggested and most people expected. The arguments against these troops were, the great expense of them, their being unnecessary if the Treaty of Seville was so advantageous as its advocates represented, and, if kept up for the defence of Hanover, a violation of the Act of Settlement.

In answer to these arguments, the expense was admitted, but the question said to be not what the expense was, but whether necessary or not; and that the Emperor's not having yet agreed to the Treaty of Seville did make it necessary; that these troops being kept up by the consent of Parliament obviated the objection of their being maintained in contravention of the Act of Settlement, even though it were allowed that their only use was to defend the Hanover dominions. This proved the legality of continuing them in our pay for that purpose; and as for the equity of it, though nobody would wish England engaged in a war for the sake of Hanover, yet if Hanover was attacked for the sake of England, no Englishman with honour or common justice would desire to see Hanover in that case abandoned and unsuccoured by those on whose account it was attacked. That this had been the sense of a former Parliament, a vote having been passed to assure the late King that if reprisals were attempted to be made on his Majesty as Elector of Hanover, for the steps he had taken as King of England, the Parliament would take care as vigor-

[17] This no doubt refers to some communication between Pulteney and Lord Hervey, probably related in the lost sheet (*antè*, p. 129).

ously to defend that country, in such a case, as their own.

It was further urged for the continuance of these 12,000 Hessians, that there could be nothing more contradictory to what had been advanced concerning the Treaty of Seville being productive of a war, than the advice now given by the same people to disband the Hessians; since if any disturbance was expected to be given by the Emperor, these troops were absolutely necessary to prevent any such design taking effect. Whether, therefore, he intended to make any diversion in the North to prevent the execution of the Treaty of Seville in Italy, or whether he might give the Dutch any trouble in resentment for their acceding to it, the Hessians must be the principal check upon him in one case, and what the Dutch had to depend upon in the other.

It was, therefore, asserted by those who spoke for the Court, to be not only for the honour of England to continue those troops, as it enabled the King to fulfil his engagements with his allies, but that it was also right in an interested prudential light, as it might deter the Court of Vienna from entering into measures to defeat the hopes of a general pacification, and spare the future expense which an ill-timed economy at this critical juncture might afterwards draw upon us.

The debate lasted till ten o'clock, and the question was at last carried for the Court by a great majority.[18]

In a few days after this debate Sir William Wyndham moved the House to appoint a day to consider the

[18] 248 to 169, *Lord Hervey* being one of the ministerial *tellers*.

state of the nation, which could not be refused by the Court party, though they would have been very glad to avoid it, scrutinies, examinations, and siftings seldom turning to the account of those who have the reins of power and the care of the public in their hands.

When the day came the ministry were totally ignorant in what quarter and on what point they should be attacked; but concluded it would either be on the Treaty of Seville, the national debt, or the complaints of the merchants. To their great surprise it proved to be upon the state of Dunkirk; which harbour was proved by many witnesses at the bar of the House to be so well repaired, that ships of burden, contrary to the Treaty of Utrecht, could go in and out with the same ease as before the demolition of it.

This thing was so well opened by Sir William Wyndham, and the facts he asserted so fully proved, that the whole House was in a flame, and the ministry stronger pushed than they had ever been on any occasion before. In order to ground a vote of censure on Mr. Walpole for suffering our present friends, the French, in this barefaced manner to violate their treaty with us, an account was demanded of all his transactions with regard to this affair during his residence as Ambassador at the Court of France; copies of the memorials he had presented there, and the letters that had passed between him and the Secretaries of State here, were likewise demanded; and, in short, so many papers were asked for, that the Opposition overshot the mark, for, time being necessary to lay these papers before the House, and time being everything to those in power, the further consideration of this affair, after

a debate that lasted till four o'clock in the morning, was adjourned for eight days, and in that space matters were so well contrived, so successfully carried on, and so expeditiously executed by the ministry, that the first paper that was read in the House on the day appointed for the further consideration of the state of Dunkirk was the copy of an absolute order from the King of France to the Governor of Dunkirk to put that harbour in the situation it ought to be by the article relating to it in the Treaty of Utrecht; and if any works contrary to the Treaties of Utrecht and the Hague had been erected, this order enjoined them forthwith to be demolished.

The true state of this affair was, that the inhabitants of Dunkirk, from the year 1718 to the present time, had, at their own expense, and though not by the command, yet by the connivance of the Court of France, constantly and gradually been working at this harbour to repair it, and had so far succeeded that, the fortifications excepted, it was in almost as good a state as before the demolition.

Mr. Walpole (as appeared in the House of Commons) had made several remonstrances at the Court of France against this proceeding, and had received several promises of justice being done; but could never obtain satisfaction by the performance of them. The close league in which we then were with the French, and had been from the time of the Treaty of Hanover, the want we had of them, the fear of breaking with them when we were well with no other Power in Europe, and our earnest desire to conclude the Treaty of Seville, had all concurred to make Mr. Walpole less

pressing on the affair of Dunkirk than he would otherwise have been, and perhaps than he ought to have been; but as soon as he had obtained that very explicit order from the Cardinal which I have already mentioned, this Dunkirk storm, that was very near shipwrecking the Administration, entirely blew over; and those who raised it had nothing to comfort them for not having demolished the Walpoles, but the glory of bragging that their industry had re-demolished Dunkirk.

A more particular account of this affair may be seen in a pamphlet, entitled 'A Summary Account of the State of Dunkirk,' &c., written by Lord Hervey.[19]

There being no supplemental money-job to be done for the Court at the end of this Session, such as the 115,000*l.* or a vote of credit, all Sir Robert Walpole's Parliamentary trouble for this year finished with the Dunkirk business; but his distress in the palace kept him still anxious. Lord Townshend's quarrel with him being got to that height that Lord Townshend would neither act on with him nor go out; he talked every day of retiring, but did not stir; the King was brought so far that he had consented to let him go, but would not force him out; the Queen wished him gone, but knew not how to make him go; and Lord Townshend, who, by quarrelling with Sir Robert Walpole and

[19] Lord Hervey intended that this, and some others of his pamphlets, should form an Appendix to these Memoirs, and he had stated in the original MS.—"I have two reasons for referring thus to papers in an appendix: the one is, that, by not inserting the substance of them in the main body of this work, people may with more ease reject the reading of them, if their curiosity leads them not to more minute explanations on those subjects they treat of; the other is, that it saves me the trouble of making extracts."

But the pamphlets are too numerous and bulky, and appear too obsolete, to justify their reproduction in these volumes.

retiring into the country, thought to step quietly out of a sinking ship, when he found the storm subsiding and the ship not likely to sink, began to repent his having turned his eyes to the shore, and had a mind to remain on board. However, it was now too late, and Lord Townshend having positively declared to the King in the winter that he would quit, Sir Robert Walpole had got the King's leave to tell Mr. Stanhope that he should succeed Lord Townshend as Secretary of State. Mr. Stanhope, as a reward for his good services in concluding the Treaty of Seville, had been immediately after created a Peer, by the title of Lord Harrington, and was now at Paris settling at that Court a plan for the execution of the Treaty of Seville by force, in case the Emperor should by force oppose it.

Lord Hervey was to succeed Lord Harrington as Vice-Chamberlain, and because it would have been a great inconvenience to have the borough of Bury lie open all the summer, it was necessary to give Lord Hervey the gold key before the breaking up of the Parliament, that he might be rechosen immediately. This enabled Sir Robert Walpole to ask the King's leave to send for the key from Lord Harrington, and to promise him the seals in lieu of it as soon as he came to England, which, of course, pushed Lord Townshend out without Sir Robert seeming to take this step directly to precipitate Lord Townshend's departure. Accordingly, the key was sent for, and given to Lord Hervey [*7th May*, 1730]; soon after Lord Harrington came over he received the seals, and Lord Townshend retired into the country. Never was any minister more gently disgraced, yet never was any dis-

graced minister more thinly attended, not one man sharing his fortune or seeming to repine at it.[20] He had made his court to the Prince by telling him that his only reason for continuing in so long was in hopes of finishing before he went the negotiation then on foot for his Royal Highness's marriage with a daughter of Prussia. Lord Carteret was turned out of the Lieutenancy of Ireland at the same time, though not as a friend of Lord Townshend's, for they hated one another mortally; Lord Carteret having been, six years before, removed from being Secretary of State and sent into this honourable Irish exile on Lord Townshend's refusing to act with him in the Secretary's office. Lord Carteret had the offer of the [Lord] Steward's Staff at his return from Ireland, but refused it; it was vacated by the Duke of Dorset's being made Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, and given, on Lord Carteret's declining it, to Lord Chesterfield, who, on this occasion, made the warmest professions to Sir Robert Walpole that it was possible to utter, acknowledging that his attachment this winter to Lord Townshend gave him no right to expect this favour, and he concluded with saying, "I

---

[20] Sir Robert Walpole explained the cause of the original difference between them in a few words: "As long as the firm was *Townshend and Walpole*, all went well; as soon as it became *Walpole and Townshend*, things went wrong."—*Coxe*, i. 339.

"Lord Townshend," says Lord Mahon, "left office with a most unblemished character, and, what is still less common, a most patriotic moderation. When Lord Chesterfield went to Raynham on purpose to persuade him to attend in the House of Lords on an important question, Townshend answered, 'I have irrevocably determined to engage no more in politics. . . . . I know I am extremely warm, and I am apprehensive I may be hurried away by my temper and my personal animosities to adopt a line of conduct which in my cooler moments I may regret.'"—Mahon's 'Hist. of England,' vol. ii. pp. 208, 209.

had lost the game, but you have taken my cards into your hand and recovered it." Upon Lord Carteret's disgrace Lord Winchelsea quitted the Comptroller's staff, having been always attached to Lord Carteret, and in most things governed by him, though on this occasion he certainly governed Lord Carteret, who had always declared that any man who hoped to get power, or hurt those who possessed it, had better be a Gentleman Usher within the palace than leave it open to his rivals by retiring out of it.

Lord Wilmington, who had been kicked in the beginning of the reign out of the House of Commons into the House of Lords, received a promotion of the same kind at this time; he was made an Earl and Privy Seal, to make way for Mr. Pelham[21] in the lucrative employment of Paymaster to the army, and was soon after, on the death of Lord Trevor, made President of the Council.

Mr. Pelham, the Duke of Newcastle's only brother, was strongly attached to Sir Robert Walpole, and more personally beloved by him than any man in England. He was a gentleman-like sort of man, of very good character, with moderate parts, in the secret of every transaction, which, added to long practice, made him at last, though not a bright speaker, often a useful one; and by the means of a general affability he had fewer enemies than commonly falls to the share of one in so high a rank.

---

[21] Henry Pelham, afterwards First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer from 1743 to his death in March, 1754.

CHAPTER VII.

Attempt of the Dissenters to repeal the Test and Corporation Acts—Walpole wishes to suppress it—Engages the Queen to induce Bishop Hoadley to dissuade the Dissenters—Hoadley's difficulties—Walpole's arguments—Negotiation between the Dissenters and the Cabinet.

THE latter end of this summer, 1730, a design was projected among all the Dissenters of England to petition the Parliament in the next Session for the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, or at least for an explanation of them in behalf of the Presbyterians, so far as these acts comprehended or affected them.

The Dissenters' plea for asking this favour of the Parliament seemed very natural and reasonable; they said they had for above forty years shown themselves steady friends to the constitution of England in the State, and constant supporters of the established government on Revolution principles; they had served hitherto without any reward, and now desired no other gratuity than the bare removal of that unjust distinction made between them and the rest of their fellow-subjects under which they had so long laboured and by which they were excluded from all employments of trust or profit. They said what made this request more reasonable was, that the hardship they now complained of had never been laid upon them at all, had they not originally consented to it themselves, and that the rea-

son of their consenting to it had been merely for the public good and the common Protestant cause; circumstances at that time requiring their voluntary submission to this self-denial act in order to facilitate the exclusion of Papists from all places of power when this kingdom was on the brink of being subjected to their sway under the authority of a Popish successor. They further added that they had not only always shown themselves unwavering and indefatigable champions for the Protestant succession, but that they had equally proved themselves firm and constant friends to what was called the Whig party, and the set of men now in power; consequently, if they could not get rid of this stigmatising brand of reproach that declared them unfit to be trusted with any employment in the executive part of the civil government under a Whig Parliament, they could never hope for relief at all, since the other set of men, who called themselves the Church party, and whom they had always opposed, should they come into power, would not only from principle forbear to show the Dissenters any favour, but would certainly from resentment go still further, and probably load them with some new oppression. Experience had already proved the probability of this conjecture by the Schism Act and other violent measures taken to oppress them in the four last years of Queen Anne's reign. In this manner they expressed their pretensions to the favour they solicited; and the reason they gave for choosing to push this point immediately was, that as the time of election for a new Parliament was now drawing near, they thought it but reasonable to try whether those who had been so long receiving favours

at their hands were ready to repay those favours with a piece of common justice, and if they were not, that the Presbyterians might in the ensuing elections have the prudence at least of being quiet, and forbear making enemies, since they were to despair of making friends.

This design of the Presbyterians put the Administration under great difficulties and into great apprehensions; they saw the injustice of opposing their petition if it came into Parliament, and the danger there was, on the other hand, of showing it any countenance; they knew it would seem the last ingratitude in any who called themselves Whigs to reject it, and the highest imprudence to receive it; for though the clergy had hitherto been kept pretty quiet by nothing being attempted either to restrain their power or to favour their adversaries, yet the ministers were sure that if any step was taken that looked like encouragement to the Dissenters, it would inevitably turn all the parsons, to a man, in the approaching elections, against every one that should appear to forward it, and as to those who did not forward it, the [Dissenting] ministers would never give them a vote again; and though in every county in England and at every election since the Revolution the Dissenters had hitherto stood by the Whigs with a firmness like that of the Triarii[1] of the Roman legion, they would certainly for the future be as little to be depended upon as any of the temporary mercenary auxiliaries of a Cornish borough.

Sir Robert Walpole, therefore, to avoid this dilemma, resolved, if possible, to prevail with the Presbyterians

[1] The most trustworthy veterans, who formed the third line, or *reserve*.

to postpone bringing their petition to Parliament till some more proper opportunity offered.

He knew Hoadley, Bishop of Salisbury, was the only man that could do him service upon this occasion, or at least that he was the most able, both from his capacity and the interest he had among this sect. But the misunderstanding and coldness which the disposition of the Bishopric of Durham[2] had created between the Bishop of Salisbury and Sir Robert Walpole made him ashamed to ask a favour of him, and a little diffident of its being granted in case he did ask it.

It was therefore agreed that the Queen herself should send for Bishop Hoadley and make it her request that he would do all in his power to divert this impending storm. Accordingly, he came to her one evening to Kensington, where, with profusion of affability, she began with telling the Bishop the occasion on which she had sent for him; and that her reason for pitching upon him was her knowing him to be not only the ablest man to serve the King in this point, but because she looked upon him as one of the readiest to serve him in all others; that his long uninterrupted known zeal for his family, and the many services he had already done them, were sufficient to convince her of this truth: but she assured him at the same time that she did not depend on his personal attachment to

[2] In 1721 Dr. Talbot was translated from Salisbury to Durham, Dr. Willis from Gloucester to Salisbury, and Hoadley from Bangor (where he had made himself remarkable by what was called the Bangorian Controversy) to Hereford. In 1723 he was translated to Salisbury. The "coldness" no doubt arose from Chandler's being chosen, in 1730, to succeed Talbot in Durham; but in 1734 Hoadley was finally placed at Winchester. Lord Hervey was a particular friend of Hoadley.

the King, or his fidelity to the interest of their family, so far as to expect anything of him that should not be perfectly consistent with the whole tenor of his conduct with regard to all his other principles, writings, and professions; and for this reason, she told him, she had not sent for him to desire he would act, write, or speak on this occasion in the least tittle contradictory to his former sentiments; but to put him in a way both to serve the Government and the Dissenters at the same time. She told him that she did not want to know his opinion upon the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, but believed she could convince him that, as all times were not proper even to do proper things, so it was impossible for the Dissenters, either for their own or for the Whig interest, to choose one more improper than the present to try their strength and their friends on this favourite point. His Lordship, she said, could not but be sensible of the divisions there were already subsisting in the Whig party, and that this question, if brought to a trial, must inevitably make another subdivision in the common friends to the Government and her family; for, as they were already split into ministerial and anti-ministerial Whigs, there would naturally sprout up a third class on this debate, who would call themselves Church Whigs, and who would profess themselves as great enemies to this innovation as any of the High Church men among the Tories. To her knowledge, she said, there were very many able, sensible, and honest men who were as zealous for the toleration on the foot it now stood, as they were for the *Revolution*, and the Protestant Government in the manner it was now constituted; but that they would

no more consent to break in on the power of the Church, by further encroachments on the ecclesiastical authority, than they would attempt any new restrictions on the prerogative of the Crown, and as little contribute to introduce a universal unlimited freedom of worship in the Church as a commonwealth in the State.

This being the case, his Lordship, she said, must see the ill consequences which this bone of contention at this time must produce even among the friends to the Government; nor would the ill effects of it stop there, for as the clergy had hitherto been kept quiet by a promise of everything in their province remaining as it was, so consequently, when that promise was broken, it would set all the turbulent spirits and ill humours of that body again afloat, and no one could foresee the infinite difficulty which that might bring upon the Government, or the confusion in which it might involve the whole kingdom: but, besides these remote inconveniences that were to be apprehended, the immediate havoc it would make in the approaching elections was certain; and, in her opinion, if a Parliamentary decision of the affair now under consideration could not be prevented, the bringing of it to a final determination at present would so split and tear the Whig party, and would make some of them so unpopular among their friends, and others so obnoxious to neutral persons, that it would be very improbable, if not impossible, for a Whig Parliament to be chosen.

Upon the whole, therefore, what she desired of his Lordship was that he would use his interest with the Dissenters to postpone this request to the Parliament till such time as those who were really their friends

should dare to show themselves so, and not be intimidated from espousing the interest of the Dissenters in Parliament by an apprehension of losing their own interest in the country.

The Bishop assured her Majesty that she was not mistaken in the opinion she had of his readiness to serve the King and her on all occasions; and that whatever his little power could do to extricate them out of any difficulties, at any time, should be done with the greatest cheerfulness, diligence, and fidelity. But as he had set out in the world with a declared attachment both to ecclesiastical and civil liberty, and that he had so often given his opinion in conversation and in print with regard to the unreasonableness of these laws in a social light, and the profaneness of them theologically considered, so it would be impossible for him ever to contradict what he had so often asserted; and therefore he must plainly and honestly tell her Majesty, that whenever the repeal of them came to be proposed in Parliament, he must always be for it, and forward as much as in him lay a step which he thought but common justice from this Government to its long-oppressed and long-faithful friends. He further told her Majesty, that as he had always declared himself so explicitly and distinguished himself so zealously on this point, it would be impossible, even though he were profligate enough to desire it, for common prudence ever to permit him to speak in any other strain on these matters. However, as a common friend both to the Whigs and the Dissenters, if it should appear, upon feeling people's pulse with regard to this thing, that the present proposal of it in Parliament might prejudice the one

without advantaging the other, he should be very glad to employ all the interest he had among the Dissenters to divert the immediate trying of this point, and would speak his opinion to the Dissenters as freely upon the success they were now likely to have, as he had now done to her Majesty of the success he thought they ought to have.

This was the substance of her Majesty's first conference with the Bishop of Salisbury on this chapter; but, soon after this conversation, there was a report spread, both in town and country, that the Queen had sent for the Bishop of Salisbury and convinced him that this request of the Dissenters was so unreasonable, that he had promised her not to support them in it. Whoever was sanguine enough to circulate this report, it was certainly as little consistent with good policy as with truth; since, if the Bishop of Salisbury had been inclined (which he was not) to favour the Administration by espousing their interest in preference to the Dissenters, this report, instead of promoting such a design, would have made the execution of it less practicable, as it would have made the Dissenters look upon the Bishop of Salisbury as less their friend, and consequently made any advice he should give them of less weight.

The Bishop was so reasonably angry and vexed at what had been given out, that he went to Sir Robert Walpole, and very fairly told him that those who had endeavoured to propagate this opinion he believed meant only hurt to himself, but in effect it would do the Administration no service. Since whatever use he might have been of to the Government on this occasion, it would certainly be necessary now for him to act

with the utmost caution, for fear of giving any colour of truth by his own conduct to these suggestions that had been made so little to his advantage. He further told Sir Robert Walpole, that he could not help owning his first consideration would now be the care of his own reputation and character; he knew how nice the situation was in which he stood at present, and how hard a part he had to act both as to the Court and as to the Dissenters, from the jealousy there would be on both sides of his partiality; but that, at all hazards, he was determined to clear up that point of his having received conviction from the Queen that the Dissenters' now making this request to Parliament was unreasonable; and said he was sure Sir Robert Walpole himself must approve his solicitude to disculpate himself of such an imputation, since in common sense and plain language such suggestions could bear no other construction than that he had been tampered with at Court till he had submitted to temporize with its authority, at the expense both of his opinion and his integrity. Sir Robert Walpole, after making the Bishop a great many professions of the cordiality of his friendship towards him, and telling him with what gratitude he thought of all the obligations he had formerly had both to his affection and his capacity, assured him that as much as the Administration wanted his assistance in this important affair, if he thought it could prejudice his own character to give it them, he would be the last man in England to ask or desire it; that as to this report of his Lordship's having been convinced by the Queen of the Dissenters' plea being unreasonable, he had never heard it, and thought, if there was any such

report, it was below his Lordship to regard it; for though there always would be some idle people on all occasions ready to make stories, and some few weak and credulous enough to believe them, yet his Lordship's sentiments were too well known, and his character too well established, for any sensible body ever to doubt of the one or receive any ill impressions of the other. That as to the main question, whether this thing ought to be done for the Dissenters or not, he was sure the Bishop did not want to know his thoughts upon it; though he looked on the application at this time as unseasonable, yet he was far from thinking the request itself, abstractedly considered, unreasonable. But, notwithstanding this, let his private opinion be what it would, people in his station, he said, must now and then act a little with regard to what others thought right, as well as what they thought right themselves; and that he had sounded many of the firmest friends to the Government upon this point, and found so many against it in opinion, as thinking it bore the appearance of breaking in on the Established Church, and so many more against it for prudential and personal reasons with regard to their interest in the country, that he was sure, if the point was now to be tried, it could not be carried; and that for this reason, how grateful soever the Court might be to the Dissenters for the services they had done this Government, and how well so ever it might wish them, yet the Administration must run such risks, and incur so much ill will, if at this juncture it appeared for them, that no prudent man could advise the King to take the unpopular part of espousing them, especially with so little

prospect of success. As to himself, in private and in confidence, he would not scruple to own to the Bishop that his heart was with them; but in this country, which was in reality a popular Government that only bore the name of monarchy, and especially in this age where clamour and faction were so prevalent over reason and justice, he said, a minister sometimes must swim with the tide against his inclination, and that the current was too strong at present against this proposal of the Dissenters for any judicious minister to think of stemming it. He further added, that if he were wholly unconcerned as a minister, and only considered this thing as a friend to the Dissenters, he should certainly rather advise them to try it at the beginning of a new Parliament than at the end of an old one, as people would be less afraid of the ferment in the country seven years before elections were again to come on, than one; and consequently those who were friends to the Dissenters would have the principal check to their showing themselves such, removed to so great a distance that it would be almost the same thing as being entirely taken away.

The Bishop asked Sir Robert if, in making use of this argument to the Dissenters, he might give them hopes of finding more favour from the Court in case they would adjourn their pretensions till the opening of a new Parliament; but Sir Robert avoided hampering himself by any promise of that kind by saying, that as such a promise could never be kept a secret, so its being known to be given for the future would have just the same ill effects as the performance of it in present; and, for that reason, whatever he thought might be

done, he would not, nor dare not, say it should be done.

The Bishop plainly saw through this artifice, and at the same time perceived that his encouraging the Dissenters to proceed further in this affair at present would only ruin his own little remnant of interest at Court, without availing them, and therefore resolved plainly to represent to them what they had to expect, and advise them not to push a point which might force many who were thought their friends to desert them, and hurt many who would stand by them, and give their enemies advantage without a possibility of procuring any benefit to themselves. Sir Robert Walpole in this interview reproved the Bishop often for acting with Lord Barrington, an Irish dissenting peer, who set himself at the head of the Presbyterians on this occasion, and who, Sir Robert told the Bishop, had neither parts to serve the cause nor reputation to give it weight: and, in truth, Lord Barrington's character was not the brightest in understanding, nor the most unsullied in integrity.[3] The Bishop had several more conferences on this subject both with the Queen and Sir Robert Walpole, but as they were all to the same effect with those I have related, I shall not recapitulate them.

The Dissenters were so sanguine all over England in this project, that in every county and great town in the kingdom they had meetings to consult upon it and methodise the execution of it, and deputations were

[3] He had been expelled the House of Commons in 1723 for "an infamous fraudulent project" called the Harburgh lottery.—*Tindal;* and *Walpoliana*, § 68.

sent from every quarter to communicate their resolutions to the body of the Dissenters in London, on whom they relied for the solicitation and management of the whole.

This enabled Sir Robert Walpole to defeat the project entirely; for out of the body of the London Dissenters a committee was to be chosen, to treat and confer with the ministers; and as the honest gentlemen who composed that committee were all monied men of the city and scriveners, who were absolutely dependent on Sir Robert, and chosen by his contrivance, they spoke only as he prompted, and acted only as he guided.

However, to save appearances, everything was to be carried on with the utmost seeming formality; this packed committee was to meet the Lord Chancellor [King], Mr. Onslow, the Speaker of the House of Commons, the Lord President of the Council [Wilmington], the two Secretaries of State [Duke of Newcastle and Lord Harrington], and Sir Robert Walpole, in order to ask and learn from these great men what the Presbyterians, in case they brought their petition now into Parliament, had to hope from the Court, the House of Lords, and the House of Commons.

Sir Robert Walpole at this meeting began with a dissertation on the subject on which they were convened, and repeated most of the things he had before said to the Bishop of Salisbury. The Speaker avoided giving his opinion on the thing itself, but was very strong and explicit on the inexpediency of bringing it now before the Parliament, and the little probability, if it was brought there, of its success. My Lord Presi-

dent looked wise, was dull, took snuff, and said nothing. Lord Harrington took the same silent, passive part. The Lord Chancellor and the Duke of Newcastle had done better had they followed that example too; but both spoke very plentifully, and were both equally unintelligible, the one from having lost his understanding,[4] and the other from never having had any.

The result of this conference was reported by the committee to a general assembly of all the Dissenters in London, convened for that purpose; and upon that report this assembly came to the following resolutions:—

First, That if a petition was to be now preferred to Parliament in their favour, that there was no prospect of success.

Secondly, That the present was consequently an improper time for any application to Parliament of that kind.

And, Thirdly, It was resolved to communicate the negotiations of the committee, and the resolutions of this assembly thereupon, to all the Dissenters in England.

In this manner this storm that threatened the Administration from the Presbyterian party blew over. Sir Robert Walpole conducted the whole affair on his part with great skill, temper, and dexterity: but the Presbyterians, as well as many who were unconcerned, saw plainly that the Dissenters' cause was betrayed, and their interests sold, by their factors in London. The Bishop of Salisbury had the misfortune, though he acted with the greatest caution and the strictest candour both towards the Court and towards the Dissent-

[4] Lord Chancellor King had been reputed an able lawyer; but about this time began to show strong symptoms of a (probably constitutional) failure of intellect, which soon incapacitated him for the woolsack.

ers, to please neither; the latter thought he had pressed their cause too little, and the other that he had supported it too much. So that it happened to him on this occasion, as it happens to most people of honesty in such delicate situations, that the more pains they take not to be in the wrong, the less either side are willing to acknowledge them to be in the right; nobody, who desires partiality, being capable of owning they received justice, though it be ever so strictly performed.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Excise Scheme—Alarm of the Country—Walpole's resolution—Session of Parliament—The Army voted—Cabal of the Lords—Lord Stair's Remonstrance with the Queen—Queen's Reply—Repeated to Lord Hervey—General clamours against the Excise—Popular delusion.

But this flame was no sooner extinguished in the nation[1] than another was kindled, and one that was much more epidemical, and raged with much greater fury. Faction was never more busy on any occasion; terrors were never more industriously scattered, and clamour never more universally raised.

That which gave rise to these commotions was a project of Sir Robert Walpole's to ease the land-tax of one shilling in the pound, by turning the duty on tobacco and wine, then payable on importation, into inland duties; that is, changing the Customs on those two commodities into Excises; by which scheme, joined

[1] It is remarkable that Coxe (iii. 48) passes, *in two lines*, the period from May, 1730, to January, 1733, as wholly unmarked by any public event, and dedicates the interval to a biography of Pulteney, and some account of his controversy and duel with Lord Hervey. Lord Hervey's Memoirs make exactly the same leap, without making a similar compensation—though there appears no hiatus in the manuscript; and it seems by the words which connect the "*Dissenters' claims*" with the "*Excise scheme*," that his Lordship *intentionally* skips over two and a half of the most interesting years of his life. These years include his quarrel with Frederick, Prince of Wales; the publication of the pamphlet which Pulteney resented as Lord Hervey's in a virulent reply, and their consequent duel; and Pope's libel on him as Sporus. I am at a loss to account for Coxe's silence as to the events of these two years, and more so for Lord Hervey's; but most of all that they should *happen* to be simultaneous.

to the continuation of the salt-duty, he proposed to improve the public revenue 500,000*l.* per annum, in order to supply the abatement of one shilling in the pound on land, which raises about that sum.

The landed men had long complained that they had ever since the Revolution borne the heat and burden of the day for the support of the Revolution Government; and as the great pressure of the last war had chiefly lain on them (the land having for many years been taxed to four shillings in the pound), they now began to say, that since the public tranquillity both at home and abroad was firmly and universally established, if ease was not at this time thought of for them, it was a declaration from the Government that they were never to expect any; and that two shillings in the pound on land was the least that they or their posterity, in the most profound peace and fullest tranquillity, were ever to hope to pay.

This having been the cry of the country gentlemen and landowners for some time, Sir Robert Walpole thought he could not do a more popular thing than to form a scheme by which the land-tax should be reduced to one shilling in the pound, and yet no new tax be substituted in the lieu thereof, no new duty laid on any commodity whatsoever, and the public revenue improved 500,000*l.* per annum, merely by this alteration in the method of management.

The salt-duty, which had been revived the year before [1732], could raise only in three years what one shilling in the pound on land raised in one year; consequently, as that tax was an equivalent only to one-third of a shilling on land, if the remission of that shilling on

land was further and annually continued, some other fund must be found to supply the other two-thirds.

This of Excising tobacco and wine was the equivalent projected by Sir Robert Walpole, but this scheme, instead of procuring him the popularity he thought it would, caused more clamour and made him even, whilst the project was only talked of and in embryo, more vilified and abused by the universal outcries of the people, than any one act of his whole administration.

The art, vigilance, and industry of his enemies had so contrived to represent this scheme to the people, and had so generally in every county and great town throughout all England prejudiced their minds against it; they had shown it in so formidable a shape and painted it in such hideous colours, that everybody talked of the scheme as a general Excise; they believed that food and raiment, and all the necessaries of life, were to be taxed; that armies of Excise officers were to come into any house and at any time they pleased; that our liberties were at an end, trade going to be ruined, Magna Charta overturned, all property destroyed, the Crown made absolute, and Parliaments themselves no longer necessary to be called.

This was the epidemic madness of the nation on this occasion; whilst most of the boroughs in England, and the city of London itself, sent formal instructions by way of memorials to their Representatives, absolutely to oppose all new Excises and all extension of Excise laws, if proposed in Parliament, though introduced or modelled in any manner whatsoever.

It is easy to imagine that this reception of a scheme by which Sir Robert Walpole proposed to ingratiate

himself so much with the people, must give him great disquiet. Some of his friends, whose timidity passed afterwards for judgment, advised him to relinquish it, and said, though it was in itself so beneficial a scheme to the public, yet since the public did not see it in that light, that the best part he could take was to lay it aside.

Sir Robert Walpole thought, since he was so far embarked, that there was no listening to such advice without quitting the King's service, for as it was once known that he designed to execute this scheme, had he given it up, everything that had been said of its tendency would have been taken for granted; and the same men who had prepossessed the minds of the people, so far as to have these things credited, would very naturally and easily have persuaded them that their rescue from ruin, and the stop that had been put to this impending blow, were entirely owing to their patriotism; that it was the stand they had made had prevented the universal destruction that had been threatened to the liberties and fortunes of the people.

Sir Robert Walpole, therefore (who, if he could have foreseen the difficulties in which this scheme involved him, would certainly never have embarked in it at all), in this disagreeable dilemma chose what he thought the least dangerous path, and resolved, since he had undertaken it, to try to carry it through. His manner of reasoning was, that if he had given way to popular clamour on this occasion, it would be raised, right or wrong, on every future occasion to thwart and check any measure that could be taken by the Government whilst he should have the direction of affairs, and that the consequence of that must be, his resignation of

his employment or his dismissal from the King's service.

About the middle of January the Parliament met as usual: the King in his speech set forth the happy situation of affairs both at home and abroad, asked nothing but the ordinary supplies for the current service of the year, and concluded as usual with a universal recommendation of temper and unanimity to the Commons in all their debates, desiring them to avoid all heat and animosities, and praying them not to be diverted by any specious pretences whatsoever from raising the supplies in the easiest manner to his people.

The two great affairs of this Session were the army and these Excises; and the reception these two points met with in the world plainly shows on what capricious and unreasonable foundations popular clamour is generally raised; for considering our constitution and the present situation of our affairs both at home and abroad, there was as little to be urged in defence of the measure of keeping up the same number of troops as there was in fair arguing against the Excise scheme; yet on the chapter of Excise the whole nation was put into a flame, whilst the army was scarcely mentioned in the country, and passed through the House little more disputed than the malt-tax, or any other of the ordinary annual supplies.

It was hoped by Sir Robert Walpole's enemies, more than feared by his friends, that the defection among the Lords on this point of the Excise would be very considerable, and that several who had long wished him ill in secret, though in public they had abetted all his measures, would take this opportunity to strike at him.

Of this number were reckoned the Duke of Argyle, the Duke of Montrose, Earl of Stair, Earl of Marchmont, Duke of Bolton, Lord Chesterfield, Lord Clinton, and Lord Cobham.[2] There were frequent meetings, intrigues, consultations, and cabals among these Lords, in what manner they should show their opposition, and what previous steps were necessary to be taken to make it most effectual.

Among many other things it was resolved that some one of them should ask an audience of the Queen in order to try how far they could work either on her reason or her fear, by telling her in the strongest terms the unfitness and unpopularity of the point pushed by her favourite, by setting forth the hazards she ran in maintaining him in it, and endeavouring to persuade her of the impossibility there was, in this universal discontent, that he should be able to carry it through.

Lord Stair was pitched upon to be the ambassador from the faction to her Majesty on this occasion. A man in years and of experience, one of the sixteen Scotch peers, who had been ambassador in France in the ticklish times of the Duke of Orleans' regency, and had acted there with skill and credit to himself, and to the honour and benefit of his country.[3]

He was reckoned a man of honour and integrity, and though he had much more of the profusion of money in his conduct than is common to his countrymen, yet the desire of getting it was as predominant in his com-

[2] These Lords were all in civil or military removeable offices.

[3] John, second Earl of Stair, a man of considerable reputation both as a soldier and a statesman. Born in 1673; he died in 1747. He served as a general officer in Marlborough's latter campaigns; and after an interval of thirty years commanded the allied army at Dettingen in 1743.

position as in the most thrifty Scotchman of them all. He had been ill with Sir Robert Walpole some years ago, but upon the Duke of Queensberry's resigning his employment of Vice-Admiral of Scotland, his Lordship, forgetting all former wrongs and resentment, wrote a most submissive letter to Sir Robert, full of the strongest professions of future friendship and good behaviour, and desired to succeed the Duke of Queensberry. He did so; but notwithstanding this boon being granted, he soon recurred to grumbling, complaining, and every other mark of his former discontent, except retiring to Scotland. His Lordship was of a very warm, prompt temper, and when he was angry did not hesitate to express his being so in very strong and irritating terms.

In the audience he asked of the Queen, he opened his embassy by telling her, that he had long thought himself neglected and ill used by those who were at the head of the Administration, but he assured her Majesty it was not that which now prompted him to give her this trouble; for, notwithstanding that ill usage, whilst the King's measures and the points proposed by his ministers in Parliament had been such as were not detrimental to the nation, her Majesty was very sensible that he had never from pique or ill humour given any opposition or aimed at obstructing whatever had been thought proper to be done. He hoped, he said, that her Majesty would give herself the trouble one moment to reflect on his past conduct, and was sure she could not then help being so just to him as to own that this was strictly true; and since it was so, he hoped her Majesty would likewise have candour enough to believe, that the strong declarations he had made against the great point

of Excise now in debate, had been entirely owing to a thorough conviction that if the personal enemies of Sir Robert Walpole and the most determined Jacobites in the kingdom had been to suggest a measure that would be the surest to serve their cause, to ruin Sir Robert Walpole, and endanger even the security of her family in this kingdom, they could not have pitched on a scheme more conducive to these ends. The scheme, he told her, was injudiciously at first concerted and hastily undertaken; that it was known to have been so now even by Sir Robert himself, and was only at present pushed by him in obstinacy, because he would not own himself guilty of an error, which must end in his disgrace or the total ruin of the nation. But as Sir Robert was reduced by his rashness, by a wantonness in power, or by a want of judgment to this fatal option; self-preservation, obstinacy, and pride had made him choose even to risk his master's Crown by alienating the affections of his subjects and forcing a scheme upon them contrary to their universal remonstrances, rather than submit to own that he had been deceived, and in consequence of that deception had endeavoured to deceive her Majesty and the King. "But, Madam, though your Majesty knows nothing of this man but what he tells you himself, or what his creatures and flatterers, prompted by himself, tell you of him, yet give me leave to assure your Majesty that in no age, in no reign, in no country was ever any minister so universally odious as the man you support. He is hated by the army, because he is known to support them against his will, and hated by the country for supporting them at all; he is hated by the clergy, because they know the support they receive

from him is policy, contrary to his principles of Whiggism, and a support he makes them earn at a dear rate; he is hated by the city of London, because he never did anything for the trading part of it, nor aimed at any interest of theirs but a corrupt influence over the directors and governors of the great monied companies; he is hated by all the Scotch to a man, because he is known to have combated every mark of favour the King has been so good to confer on any of that nation; and he is little better beloved by many Englishmen, even of those who vote with him and serve under him. His power being thus universally dreaded, and his measures being thus universally disliked, and your Majesty being thought his protectress; give me leave to say, Madam, the odium incurred by his oppressions and injustice is not entirely confined to his own person; and as everybody, Madam, does imagine that he cannot be so blind, so deaf, and so insensible as not to see, hear, and know himself obnoxious to the people of all ranks and denominations in the kingdom—so it is thought the only resource he now has is to throw power into the hands of the Crown, where he must take refuge, and from whence alone he can hope for protection. People are confirmed in this opinion by this enslaving scheme of Excises, which they neither do nor can think upon in any other light. And if your Majesty thinks the English so degenerated, and the minds of the people so enslaved, as to receive chains without struggling against those who endeavour to fasten them; if you are willing to risk the power the law has given to the Crown, in order to add an illegal authority inconsistent with the fundamental principles of this Government; if you wish to do it and think it

can be done, you are in the right to persevere in the maintenance of this project and projector, and in contradiction to the manifest bent of the nation, in contempt of the universal clamour of the kingdom, in defiance of an irritated people, and in a thorough disregard to the nature of the Constitution and the laws of a free country. (That he absolutely governs your Majesty nobody doubts, and very few scruple to say; they own you have the appearance of power, and say you are contented with the appearance, whilst all the reality of power is his, derived from the King, conveyed through you, and vested in him.) The King is looked upon as the engine of his minister's ambition, and your interest and influence over him as the secret springs by which this minister gives motion to all his master's actions. No greater proof can be given of the infinite sway this man has usurped over you, Madam, than in the very instance I have given of his first personal injury to me, which is the preference he has given Lord Isla to me on every occasion, both here and in Scotland: for what cannot that man persuade you to, who can make *you*, Madam, love a Campbell? The only two men in this country who ever vainly hoped or dared to attempt to set a mistress's[4] power up in opposition to yours were Lord Isla and his brother the Duke of Argyle; yet one of the men who strove to dislodge you by this method from the King's bosom, is the man your favourite has thought fit to place the nearest to his; a man, too, who is as little useful in his public character as amiable in his private one; one as mean in his conduct as in

[4] Mrs. Howard. See the grounds for this statement, in the *Reminiscences* and the *Suffolk Correspondence*, i. 40, &c.

his aspect, and who acts no more like a man of quality than he looks like one; a man of as little weight as principle, and no more fit to be trusted with any commission that requires ability and judgment than with one that requires honesty and fidelity."

Here the Queen interrupted the thread of Lord Stair's invectives, and told him, in the first place, with regard to Lord Isla and himself, that she neither was nor desired to be informed of the causes of the misunderstandings between them; that she should be a very incompetent judge of the particulars if they were before her, and desired not to be made acquainted with them, because she should be as unwilling to speak her opinion if she had been able to form one, as she was now to enter into the dispute without having any opinion about it at all; that it was not her business to canvass the private characters and quarrels of those the King thought fit to employ, and, therefore, whenever his Lordship spoke of Lord Isla to her, she desired he would remember he was speaking of the King's servant and to the King's wife.

This rebuke silenced Lord Stair on Lord Isla's chapter, and when he resumed his speech, he told her Majesty, that his reason for saying what he had done, was not so much from his own personal resentment to Lord Isla, as to let her Majesty know what sort of men these were, and how the world thought of them, who had the happiness of being most distinguished by the honest and judicious minister she maintained; and though he was not allowed to tell the faults of those this minister espoused, he hoped at least he might be at liberty to speak the merit of those he endeavoured to depress; and if he had that liberty, the list would consist of the names of

every man of worth, honour, and probity in her Court. "Your Majesty little thinks of the defection there will be among the nobility on this point. I know it to be such (for it is not conjecture) as will startle not only your minister when it breaks out, but even his master and yourself. I know it will be such as will make it impossible for this Bill to pass the Lords, though power and corruption may force it through the Commons. This being the case, I would oppose it even in policy, were my conscience quite out of the question; but if policy were as strong on the other side, yet, Madam, I think it so wicked, so dishonest, so slavish a scheme, that my conscience would no more permit me to vote for it than his ought to have permitted him to project it."

When Lord Stair talked of his conscience with such solemnity, the Queen (the whole conversation being in French) cried out—"*Ah, my Lord! ne me parlez point de conscience; vous me faites évanouir.*" Lord Stair was extremely shocked and nettled at this exclamation, and said he hoped no action of his had ever betrayed any want either of conscience or honour, and that his whole life had been guided by the strictest laws of both: and since it had been so, he assured her Majesty, he had no notion that the profligacy of mankind could be such, as to make it possible for her favourite to find a majority of the House of Commons who, with repeated obstinate injustice and a shameless violation of their trust, would persevere in passing a Bill so evidently opposite to the inclinations of their constituents, so destructive of their interests and their liberties, and so contradictory to their express instructions and commands.

"Surely, my Lord," replied the Queen, "you think

you are either talking to a child or to one that doats; for supposing this Bill to be everything which you have described it to be, do you imagine I should be weak enough to believe that you would oppose it for the reasons you have given? or that it would be natural for you to think that these arguments you have mentioned would weigh with anybody? Do you, my Lord, pretend to talk of the opinion of electors having any influence on the elected? You have made so very free with me personally in this conference, my Lord, that I hope you will think I am entitled to speak my mind with very little reserve to you; and believe me, my Lord, I am no more to be imposed upon by your professions than I am to be terrified by your threats. I must therefore once more ask you, my Lord, how you can have the assurance to talk to me of your thinking the sense of constituents, their interest, or their instructions any measure or rule for the conduct of their representatives in Parliament; or if you believe I am so ignorant or so forgetful of all past proceedings in Parliament, as not to know that in the only occasion where these considerations should have biassed you, you set them all at nought? Remember the Peerage Bill, my Lord. Who then betrayed the interest of their constituents? Who gave up the birthright of their constituents? Who deprived their constituents of all chance of ever taking their turn with those whom they then sent to Parliament? The English Lords in passing that Bill were only guilty of tyranny, but every Scotch Lord was guilty of the last treachery; and whether you were one of the sixteen traitors, your own memory, I believe, will serve to tell you without the assistance of mine. To

talk, therefore, in the patriot strain you have done to me on this occasion, can move me, my Lord, to nothing but laughter. Where you get your lesson, I do not want to know: your system of politics you collect from the 'Craftsman;' your sentiments, or rather your professions, from my Lord Bolingbroke and my Lord Carteret—whom you may tell, if you think fit, *that I have long known to be two as worthless men of parts as any in this country, and whom I have not only been often told are two of the greatest liars and knaves in any country, but whom my own observation and experience have found so.* If you think, you may also, by way of supplement, let Lord Carteret know that I am not yet reduced to wanting his protection, though I hear he bragged of having had the generosity to bestow it upon me when the affair of the Charitable Corporation was under prosecution in the House of Lords, and that he saved me from being exposed there. For the rest, my good Lord, as an old acquaintance, the best advice I can give you, if you are a friend to the King, is to detach yourself from his enemies; if you are a friend to truth, to take your intelligence for the future from those who deal in it; if you are a friend to honesty, not to herd with those who disclaim it; and, if you are a friend to our family, never to cabal with those who look on ours and the Jacobites' cause as things indifferent in themselves, and to be espoused or combated in no other view, and on no other motive, than as this or that may least or most conduce to thwarting or gratifying their own private avarice and ambition."

Lord Stair said he perceived her Majesty was determined; but that she would see her error, and he hoped

before it was too late. He worked himself up again into a violent passion, and took his leave in saying *Madame, vous êtes trompée, et le Roi est trahi.*

The Queen, one evening when Lord Hervey came to give her an account of some debate in the House of Lords or Commons (which he did constantly through the whole Session), told him every circumstance of this conversation in the manner it is here related (excepting that of Lord Isla and the Duke of Argyle having set up the power of a mistress in opposition to hers, which she did not mention; that was a particular which Lord Hervey had from Sir Robert Walpole): and this account agreeing in every essential part with that Sir Robert Walpole gave Lord Hervey of the rest of the conversation, as well as with the report Lord Stair made of it to his friends, I believe there can be no doubt but that the greatest and most material part of what I have related concerning this extraordinary conference is strictly and literally true. At the same time that the Queen let Lord Hervey into this anecdote, she told him Lord Stair had desired that the particulars of this conference might be kept secret, which she promised to do on her part as long as he submitted to do so on his; but finding, by private intelligence, joined to a public incident, that Lord Stair had bragged to Lord Carteret, as well as many others, of the strong things he had said to her, and that he had given out he had staggered her, she told Lord Hervey she looked upon herself as freed from that promise of secrecy—*et j'ai pris d'abord la première occasion d'égosiller tout.*

The public incident which convinced her Majesty that

Lord Stair had acquainted Lord Carteret with what had passed was this:—in debate in the House of Lords on the affair of the troops for this year, some few days after this interview, Lord Carteret, by a little declamatory digression, took occasion to inveigh against Excises and evil ministers, and found means this way to interweave in his speech an account that, when France was ruled and oppressed by Cardinal Mazarin supported by the Queen Mother (then Regent), in opposition to the clamour of the people and inclination of the whole kingdom, that the *greatest general of his time, and a man of the first consideration at the Court, asked an audience of the Queen*, and in that interview told her, "*Madam, you maintain a man at the helm that should be rowing in your galleys.*"

When Lord Hervey told the Queen of this, she asked if there was nobody of the Court side in the House who was well read enough in the history of those times to tell Lord Carteret, from the Memoirs of the Cardinal de Retz, that the Prince of Condé (who was the general Lord Carteret meant) never opposed the measures of Cardinal Mazarin till the Cardinal found his ambition so insatiable that it was impossible to content him, and that the audience that Prince asked of the Queen was in order to impose upon her in the same manner he had endeavoured to impose on all France, which was by trying to persuade everybody that the effects of his private resentment were only the consequences of his zeal for the King and the public?

Lord Hervey said he was sorry none of her servants were so capable of answering Lord Carteret on this part of French history as he found her Majesty would

have been; and wished she had been present, to have given any of them this hint, and to have said, like Agrippina,—

"——Derrière une voile, invisible et présente,
Je fus de ce grand corps l'âme toute puissante." [5]

The Queen laughed, did not dislike the compliment, and said that she did not doubt but that he was as well versed in De Retz as Racine, and that if he had been there, she should not have been wanted: but, said she, as you often tell me of my pride, I will now confess to you an instance of it, and to carry on the parallel you have drawn between me and Agrippina, will own to you that I very often feel myself, in conference *avec ces impertinens*—

"Fille, femme, et mère de vos maîtres."

Lord Hervey said he was very glad her pride had so great a pleasure in reflecting on that which all her subjects had so great an advantage in her being.

Lord Stair boasted much to all his party, who circulated the history, of the bold truths he told the Queen, and the strong effect they seemed to have upon her. At the same time many pamphlets were written and dispersed in the country, setting forth the dangerous consequences of extending the Excise Laws, and increasing the number of Excise-officers; showing the infringement of the one upon liberty, and the influence the other must necessarily give the Crown in elections. And so universally were these terrors scattered through the nation, and so artfully were they instilled into the minds of the people, that this project, which in reality

[5] Britannicus, a. i. s. 1.

was nothing more than a mutation of two taxes from Customs to Excises, with an addition of only one hundred and twenty-six officers in all England for the collection of it, was so represented to the whole country, and so understood by the multitude, that there was hardly a town in England, great or small, where nine parts in ten of the inhabitants did not believe that this project was to establish a general Excise, and that everything they eat or wore was to be taxed; that a colony of Excise-officers was to be settled in every village in the kingdom, and that they were to have a power to enter all houses at all hours; that every place and every person was to be liable to their search; and that such immense sums of money were to be raised by this project, that the Crown would no longer be under the necessity of calling Parliaments for annual grants to support the Government, but be able to provide for itself, for the most part; and whenever it wanted any extraordinary supplies, that the Excise-officers, by their power, would be able at any time to choose just such a Parliament as the Crown should nominate and direct.

The effect these suggestions, inculcated and believed, must have on the minds of a people jealous of their liberties, susceptible of impressions, and prone to clamour, is easy to conceive. Every alarm sounded from the faction in London came reverberated by a thousand echoes from every part of the country; the whole nation was in a flame, and fresh fuel was constantly supplied by those who first kindled it, to keep it blazing.

Sir Robert Walpole delayed as long as he could

bringing the proposal into Parliament, in hopes the clamour might subside, and the members consequently be less intimidated by the remonstrances of their constituents; pamphlets were written, too, during this delay, on the side of Government, and sent all over England by the Administration, to show the people they had been imposed upon, blown up by false insinuations, and that the project was nothing more than a scheme to correct frauds committed in these two branches of the revenue, tobacco and wine, by which means it was proposed to raise the revenue enough to continue the reduction of the land-tax at one shilling in the pound without imposing any new tax on the subject and without increasing any tax already laid; but merely by this alteration in the method of collecting two duties already granted, which the consumer and fair trader now paid, and of which the public was defrauded by the evaders of the laws and the illicit dealers in these commodities.

But all this reasoning was to no purpose; the people would neither hear arguments, examine facts, nor believe demonstration; and the universal cry of the kingdom was, *No slavery—no Excise—no wooden shoes!*

I cannot help here remarking, that upon all the Excise duties laid by Parliament since the Restoration (and some there have been in every reign from that time to this), there never was the least clamour raised in the country, or any opposition to them in Parliament, on any other foot than a dispute whether they would answer the charge of collection by their produce. Those, therefore, who accuse Sir Robert Walpole of want of penetration in not foreseeing the difficulties

into which this scheme would lead him, are of that class (and a numerous one it is) who imagine that every event is so little casual, that whatever is, could not have been otherwise; and of course, with equal folly, impute all success to prudence, and all disappointments to indiscretion. But it is not to such fools that I write, though, to my sorrow, it is with such I daily converse—creatures who, though they laugh at magic, have a faith in a sort of terrestrial astrology (if I may be allowed the expression), and fancy every incident resulting really from accident the necessary consequence of a chain of causes, which every able political astrologer might foresee: and though these refining commentators have a thousand times found themselves in situations both of prosperity and distress, without being able to account how they came there, yet experience teaches them in vain the fallacy of their opinion, and they still continue to impute the success of the prosperous to contrivance, and the miscarriage of the unfortunate to imprudence.

CHAPTER IX.

Mobs at Westminster—The Excise unpopular in the House—Majorities decrease—Anxiety of the King—His views of Government—Influenced by the Queen—Lord Scarborough's remonstrance—Walpole hesitates and offers to retire—Spirit of the King and Queen—Opposition at Court—Her notions of official discipline—The Excise Scheme abandoned—Riots—Complained of, in Parliament, and turned to the advantage of the Minister.

At last the day came [*Wednesday, 14th of March*] when this Excise proposition was to be canvassed in Parliament; it was reported, the night before, that thousands of people would come down next day to the door of the House of Commons, to petition the Members, as they passed, to reject it: and menaces were whispered about to terrify all who should appear for it.

To prevent the mischief that might be apprehended from such multitudes gathering together and falling into riot and tumult, proper directions were given to the justices of the peace, constables, and civil magistrates, to attend and keep the peace; and secret orders were likewise given both to the horse and foot Guards to be in readiness to march, in case of exigence and extremity, at a moment's warning.

The mob came down to Westminster, but not in so numerous a body as was expected, and in much better order: however, there were enough so to throng and crowd the lobby and Court of Requests, that it was with the utmost difficulty that the Members of the House could pass in and out.

After a long debate, which lasted till one o'clock in the morning, the question was carried in a committee of the whole House, for the Excise scheme, by a majority of 61; the numbers were 204 and 265.

Sir Robert Walpole, by the advice of all his friends, to avoid the insults that some of this rabble might have offered him, went out of the House the back way, through the Speaker's chamber, to Lord Halifax's,[1] where he supped, from whence he came away privately, after the multitude was dispersed and all quiet.

This multitude was kept in so good order, that, excepting now and then a hiss upon some of the Court party when they came out, a little pointing and a loud whisper of *That 's one of them!* there was very little indecency or disorder committed. One there was among these people ruder than the rest, whom General Wade took by the collar, but, upon his submission and entreaty, the General let him go again, telling him he was a scoundrel and below his further notice.

Lord Hervey went, as soon as the House was up, to give the King an account of all that had passed within doors and without; the King was so anxious and so impatient, that he had made Lord Hervey write to him from the House at five o'clock to tell him what face matters wore.

As soon as Lord Hervey came to St. James's the King carried him into the Queen's bed-chamber, and there kept him without dinner till near three in the morning, asking him ten thousand questions, relating

[1] Lord Halifax, as Auditor of the Exchequer, had an official residence adjoining the House of Commons—the same, I believe, that was subsequently appropriated to the Speaker.

not only to people's words and actions, but even to their looks.

Sir Robert Walpole had so prepossessed the King in favour of this scheme, that if it had been an act to secure and settle the Crown of England on him and his posterity, he could not have been more eager in the measure, more anxious for its fate, or more solicitous for its success.

The light in which Sir Robert Walpole had represented this scheme to the King was, that since he had settled the peace of Europe and regulated the pretensions of all the great Princes—since he had shown himself absolute master of that balance of power which England ought to hold—and that the wisdom and prudence of his counsels had adjusted all difficulties and got over all obstacles arising from the various views and claims of foreign Princes—that it might be expected of him he should now turn his thoughts towards making the best use he could of this success abroad by letting it contribute to the ease of his subjects at home; that to do that in the most popular and most effectual mânner would be to give ease in the land-tax, as it was the most unequal tax, and the most generally complained of, of any tax now subsisting; and as this measure would make every landowner and country gentleman a zealous friend to his Government, so it would be the glory of his reign, and one not to be paralleled by any reign since the Revolution; that he had reduced the land-tax to one shilling in the pound, which was not only lower than ever it had been since it was first laid, but lower than the most sanguine landowner in the kingdom ever hoped to see it.

But, besides the glory and the popularity of this scheme, there was a consideration which, I believe, had its weight with his Majesty, and that was, that if this scheme took effect, one-sixth of the duties on tobacco and wine being part of the Civil List funds, that part of his revenue would of course be increased one-sixth of whatever gain should accrue to the public by this mutation. For though, to cover this acquisition to the Crown, it was made part of the scheme that the Civil List duty should still be payable at the Customs, yet people easily saw through that thin veil, and could, without great penetration, reason that whatever measures were taken to prevent the running of these commodities, by making them liable to an inland duty after they had got clear of the ports, would increase this duty in the Customs in the same proportion that it would be raised in the Excise, since the merchant and proprietor of these commodities would never run any risk or be at any expense to evade the Custom-house officer at the first gate, when at so many more afterwards he would be equally exposed to be catched by the Excise-officer.

As this consideration of increasing the Civil List had weighed with the King to espouse this scheme, so Sir Robert Walpole made a second use of it by telling the King it was the chief reason why the adverse party opposed it; by which means his Majesty was induced to look on this opposition to the scheme as more personal to himself than to his minister, as there was an advantage evidently to accrue to the one, without the least appearance of emolument to the other.

During the whole progress of this Bill, which lasted about three weeks, the King was under the greatest

anxiety for the event of it. Lord Hervey and Mr. Pelham were with Him and the Queen almost every day to give them accounts, not only how people voted and talked in the House, but how they looked and how they spoke, and how they caballed in the town. Every division showing a decrease in the majority, the King grew, every division, more and more uneasy. Upon his saying one night to Lord Hervey that he never knew the Opposition, on any occasion in his reign, so strong, so sanguine, and so insolent, Lord Hervey, who had a mind to soften the difficulties he knew the Administration was in, put his Majesty in mind of the Dunkirk year, and said he thought the opposing party was much stronger, their spirits much higher, and the ground they fought on much better, at that junction than he had ever known them at any other. The King with some warmth replied, "Pooh! you talk of a time when my servants lay under all the disadvantages it was possible for a ministry to be exposed to. In the first place, it was so early in my reign, that nobody knew whether I had any resolution in my temper, or any steadiness in my counsels, or not. In the next place, the ministry were divided and torn by contention among themselves; that was at a time when Townshend was in place, and was giving Walpole all the trouble he could, both in the Parliament and in my closet: Carteret was not yet discharged—there were a thousand different parties among my ministers, and nobody knew whom I would support: at such a time it was no wonder my business met with obstructions, or that it was neglected, when every one that should have done it had his own private business to mind, and knew not what

he had to trust to. A prince who will be well served in this country, must free his minister from all apprehensions at Court, that the minister may give all his attention to the affairs of his master; which, with all the support that master can give him, are still liable, from the nature of this Government and the capriciousness of the people, to ten thousand accidents and difficulties unknown in other countries."

I mention this passage to show how much the Queen, by frequently inculcating her doctrine, had in five years changed his Majesty's first plan of government. His design at his first accession to the throne was certainly, as Boileau says of Louis XIV.,—

> " Seul, sans ministre, à l'exemple des Dieux,
> Faire tout par sa main et voir tout de ses yeux."

He intended to have all his ministers in the nature of clerks, not to give advice, but to receive orders; and proposed, what by experiment he found impracticable, to receive applications and distribute favours through no principal channel, but to hear from all quarters, and employ indifferently in their several callings those who by their stations would come under the denomination of ministers. But it was very plain, from what I have just now related from the King's own lips, as well as from many other circumstances in his present conduct, that the Queen had subverted all his notions and schemes, and fully possessed his Majesty with an opinion that it was absolutely necessary, from the nature of the English Government, that he should have but one minister; and that it was equally necessary, from Sir Robert's superior abilities, that he should be that one. But this work, which she now saw com-

pleted, had been the work of long time, much trouble, and great contrivance; for though, by a superiority of understanding, thorough knowledge of his temper, and much patience in her own, she could work him by degrees to any point where she had a mind to drive him, yet she was forced to do it often by slow degrees, and with great caution; for, as he was infinitely jealous of being governed, he was never to be led but by invisible reins; neither was it ever possible for her to make him adopt her opinion but by instilling her sentiments in such a manner as made him think they rose originally from himself. She always at first gave into all his notions, though never so extravagant, and made him imagine any change she wrought in them to be an afterthought of his own. To contradict his will directly, was always the way to strengthen it; and to labour to convince, was to confirm him. Besides all this, he was excessively passionate, and his temper upon those occasions was a sort of iron reversed, for the hotter it was the harder it was to bend, and if ever it was susceptible of any impression or capable of being turned, it was only when it was quite cool.

At the same time that the Queen had changed his maxims of policy, she had by degrees too entirely altered both his opinion of his servants and his affection for them. Lord Wilmington and Lord Townshend, whom he had loved and admired, he now contemned and disliked; the one he had discharged from his confidence, though he still kept him in employment, and the other he had dismissed from both. His way of thinking, and his behaviour towards Sir Robert, was full as much, and as visibly, changed as to the other

two; for, instead of betraying (as formerly) a jealousy of being thought to be governed by him—instead of avoiding every opportunity of distinguishing and speaking to him in public—instead of hating him whilst he employed him, and grudging every power with which he armed him — he very apparently now took all occasions to declare him his first, or rather his sole, minister; singled him out always in the Drawing-room; received no application (military affairs excepted) but from him; and most certainly, if he loved anybody in the world besides the Queen, he had not only an opinion of the statesman, but an affection for the man. Of this affection he gave many little instances, in talking of him, much easier to be perceived than described, as they are things that would make no figure in repetition; but, by the manner and at the times in which they were said, it was very plain he loved as well as admired him. When Lord Hervey (often to try him) gave him accounts of attacks that had been made on Sir Robert Walpole in the House, and the things Sir Robert had said in defence of himself and in retaliation on his adversaries, the King would often cry out, with colour flushing into his cheeks and tears sometimes in his eyes, and with a vehement oath, "*He is a brave fellow; he has more spirit than any man I ever knew.*" The Queen, if she was by, always joined in chorus upon such occasions: and Lord Hervey, in these partial moments, never failed to make the most he could of his friend and patron's cause.[2]

[2] Lord Hervey adds that "the night after the first debate on the Tobacco Bill he, amongst many other things which had passed in the debate, told the King and Queen that Mr. Pulteney had said in his speech that

On the Monday morning [*9th April*] before that Wednesday that was appointed for the second reading of the Bill, Lord Scarborough came to Sir Robert Walpole, to let him know that he found the clamour so hot and so general, that it was his opinion the Administration ought to yield to it; that, for his own part, how right soever he might think this scheme in an abstracted light, yet, considering the turn it had taken, he was determined not to contribute to cram it down the people's throats; and came to tell Sir Robert that, if it should be forced through the House of Commons, and brought into the House of Lords, he would oppose it there. He said, by the best information he could get, the dislike of this scheme was almost as universal among the soldiery as the populace, and that the military part of the commonalty were as much prejudiced against it as the mercantile people. The soldiers, he said, had got a notion that it would raise the price of tobacco, and upon this notion were so universally set against the scheme, that they cursed the Administration and the Parliament, murmured treason even under the walls of the palace, and were almost as ripe for mutiny as the nation for rebellion.

Sir Robert Walpole heard him with a great deal of temper and patience, and at last said, "My dear Lord, you have too much honesty to suspect, and consequently to see, how little there is in some who bring you these tales, or get them conveyed to you, and are, without knowing it, influenced by men who are as much inferior

---

the inscription on Sir R. Walpole's tomb should be, "This is the man who would have enslaved his country by an Excise!" at which the King was very indignant.

to you in understanding as in integrity. We both understand one another, and whatever may be the fate of this Bill, I have nothing but this to desire of you—as I am your friend, and wish to have you continue mine—when those who have kindled this flame and fomented these discontents till they have brought things, as you say, even at the door of the palace, to the brink of rebellion—when they shall receive their reward for that conduct—do not you make their cause your own, or sacrifice your interest to those who have throughout this whole proceeding had no regard to yours, or to anything but the gratification of their own capricious resentment."

Lord Hervey came into the room just as Sir Robert Walpole had pronounced these words, and soon after Lord Scarborough took his leave. Sir Robert immediately told Lord Hervey what had passed, who said he was not so much surprised as Sir Robert seemed to be; "For you know, Sir, I long ago told you Lord Chesterfield governed him as absolutely as he does any of his younger brothers: and though you may think Lord Scarborough loves you personally, which was the security you told me you depended upon for his never undertaking or joining in anything against your interest, yet I own I see very little difference between that attachment not existing at all or existing in a degree inferior to the influence of those who wish to prevent its operating. But, upon the whole, Sir, what resolution will you take, or have you taken, with regard to dropping or going on with the Bill?" Sir Robert said he must see the King and the Queen, and be determined what course to steer by the temper and disposition in which he found them.

Had Lord Scarborough, from apprehension only, said this in private to Sir Robert Walpole, it would have left people some room to excuse his conduct, and think his proceeding fair and honourable; but before he made this declaration to Sir Robert Walpole he had already told his opinion and the resolution to several people, who had circulated the news of this considerable deserter through all the town. He certainly ought not, after the part he had acted, to have opened his lips on this subject to any one but Sir Robert; for, as he had been so warm a promoter of this scheme, and, till three days before it was laid aside, on all occasions asserting the propriety of it, most people were of opinion his defection proceeded from the increased number of objectors to the Bill, and not from the discovery of any new objections.

This evening [*9th April*] Sir Robert Walpole saw the King in the Queen's apartment, just before the Drawing-room, and the final resolution was then taken to drop the Bill; but, as there was a petition to come from the City of London against it the next day, it was resolved that the Bill should not be dropped till that petition was rejected, lest it should be thought to be done by the weight and power of the City.

Sir Robert Walpole, in coming from this conference, called on Lord Hervey (whose lodgings were just at the foot of the Queen's back staircase), to let him know what had passed. Sir Robert was extremely disconcerted, and seemed under full as much anxiety as he described the King and the Queen: Lord Hervey told him he had been twice sent for that afternoon by the King, but, not knowing in what strain to talk to him, as he was

ignorant whether Sir Robert intended to go forward or retreat, and that he should be asked millions of questions relating to what he saw, what he heard, and what he thought, so, to avoid the difficulties this catechism would lay him under, he had kept out of the way. Sir Robert Walpole bade him be sure to stick to the necessity there was of not seeming to yield this point at the instigation of the City, and left all the rest to his own discretion. But though Sir Robert communicated to Lord Hervey many particulars of the conversation he had just held with the Queen, there was one very material circumstance, as natural for Lord Hervey to guess as for the Minister to be a little ashamed and reluctant to repeat, on which he was quite silent; a circumstance which the Queen afterwards told Lord Hervey, and which Sir Robert Walpole never knew Lord Hervey had been made acquainted with; for as the one from pride or shame had forborne to communicate, so the other in policy did not care to let his benefactor and friend have the mortification of knowing that what he wished should be a secret to everybody was not so to him; and though many people would have reasoned differently on this occasion, and have acquainted Sir Robert Walpole with what they had learned, in order to make a merit of their taciturnity afterwards; yet Lord Hervey judged otherwise, and looked upon this secret to be of the nature of some which all those concerned in them hate you more for having it in your power to tell, than they can love you for not making use of that power.

The circumstance concealed was this:—when Sir Robert Walpole told the Queen the clamour against this Bill was grown to that height that there was no

contending with it any longer, he said there were two ways of trying to appease it, the one by dropping the Bill (which would not be sure to quiet the commotions the prosecuting of it had caused), the other was by dropping the projector as well as the project; which, whatever bad consequences such yielding to clamour might have in futurity, would certainly have this immediate good effect,—that for the present, at least, all troubles would subside, and everything be calm and still. What troubles the struggles for power, among those who had raised these storms to subvert his interest, might occasion in the Palace, and how headstrong this concession to a mob might afterwards make that mob in future administrations, were considerations, he said, which he would not suggest, for fear he might be thought to urge them as arguments for his own continuance in employment: whereas he was so far from desiring to be *in* her Majesty's service, if she thought it was not *for* her service, that he should lay down and retire with all the satisfaction in the world; and, if her Majesty thought it for the advantage of the King's affairs, or that it would facilitate in any manner the King's business in Parliament, that he was ready that very night to quit; and should never impute his disgrace to her Majesty's want of kindness towards him, but merely to his own ill fortune. The Queen chid him extremely for having so ill an opinion of her as to think it possible for her to be so mean, so cowardly, and so ungrateful, as to accept of such an offer; and assured him that as long as she lived she would not abandon him. When Sir Robert Walpole made the same offer to the King, his Majesty (as the Queen told me) made the most kingly, the

most sensible, and the most resolute answer that it was possible for a wise, a just, and a great prince to make, to the most able and to the most meritorious servant: but whether she dictated the words before he spoke them, or embellished them afterwards, I know not. As well as I can remember them, they were to this effect:—That Sir Robert had served him honestly and faithfully; that his Majesty knew all this bustle was owing to personal enmity or contention for power in the administration of his affairs; that he knew Sir Robert Walpole's reason for concerting the land-tax scheme was, that it might be the glory of his reign to take off the land-tax, which had been a burden laid on the landed interest in consequence of the Revolution, and which never since the Revolution any prince had been able to remit; that it was true he had miscarried in that design, but that his having done so had made his Majesty not angry with him for failing in this undertaking, but with those who had obstructed it: he said he was very sensible Sir Robert Walpole could have had no interest of his own in concerting or pushing this scheme, and that since he had done it only for the honour and service of his master, that that master would never forsake him, but that they should stand or fall together. This, as the Queen told me, was the King's answer to Sir Robert when he made him the offer of quitting; and that Sir Robert should be more reluctant to own to Lord Hervey that he had made this offer of resigning, than ready to boast of its being so received, I think was odd, but so it was.

When Lord Hervey went up to the Drawing-room he saw her Majesty had been weeping very plentifully;

and found her so little able to disguise what she felt, that she was forced to pretend head-ache and vapours, and break up her quadrille party sooner than the usual hour.

When the Drawing-room was over, the King, after dismissing the rest of his servants, called Lord Hervey into the Queen's bed-chamber, and began with great eagerness to ask him where he had been all day, whom he had seen, and what he had heard, and how our friends and how our foes both looked? Lord Hervey told him he found the most zealous friends to the Excise began to be of opinion that, considering what had happened at this end of the town, the clamour at the other grew too hot to be struggled with. The King asked him what he meant by "the things that had happened at this end of the town." Lord Hervey said he meant only what was reported, and did not pretend to say how far those reports were grounded upon truth. "Why, what is reported?" "Since your Majesty commands me to tell you, I shall. It is reported, Sir, by the enemies to this Bill, that several of the Cabinet Council and several of your Majesty's domestic servants have asked audiences to let your Majesty know that they will not positively vote for the Bill; and the comment that is made on this report is, that if those who have the honour to serve your Majesty in such near and high stations did not know this declaration would not be displeasing to you, they would certainly not have ventured, so explicitly at least, to have made it. This being told and almost generally believed, the dependence on so strong a party at the present juncture under your Majesty's roof has given the Opposition

such spirits and such strength that it is my firm opinion the Bill cannot be carried, and, consequently, that the friends to it had better consent to the dropping it, than fight till its enemies grow strong enough to reject it."

The King asked "whom of his Council and his family people named for having made these declarations." Lord Hervey said several of those whom his Majesty, when he had done him the honour to talk on this subject before, had himself named as no well-wishers to the scheme; but that the two that people talked most of at present, as they were reckoned the last that had absolutely declared themselves, were Lord Clinton [a Lord of the Bedchamber] and Lord Scarborough [Master of the Horse]. The King replied with great warmth, "It is a lie; those rascals in the Opposition are the greatest liars that ever spoke. Clinton has been with me, but Scarborough never has mentioned the Excise to me at all, and for these last five or six days he has kept out of my way. I have not so much as seen him, nor have any of my servants dared to tell me they would not do what I would have them."

The King, after walking about the room in great anger and disorder for some time, and saying several things with great vehemence that showed plainly he was both vexed and staggered, dismissed Lord Hervey and charged him to write an account next day, from the House of Commons during the debate, what face things wore, what turn they were like to take, and how both our friends and our foes behaved.

The petition of the City was presented the next morning [10*th April*], and attended by the citizens in

a train of coaches that reached from Westminster to Temple Bar. The prayer of the petition was, that they might be heard by their counsel against the Bill. The debate upon it lasted till midnight, and though this was the strongest point for the Court that had yet been debated in the whole progress of the Bill, as it was contrary to the rules and orders of the House to comply with petitions of this nature against taxes that are going to be laid, yet even on this point the Court party was so weak that the rejection of this extraordinary demand was carried by a majority only of *seventeen* voices [214 to 197].

The Opposition was so elate on this victory (for such it was, properly speaking) that they concluded nothing less was to happen upon it than a total change of the Administration, commencing by the immediate dismission and disgrace of Sir Robert Walpole, who was never more struck with any defeat or less able to disguise his being so than this night. He stood some time after the House was up, leaning against the table with his hat pulled over his eyes, some few friends with melancholy countenances round him, whilst his enemies with the gaiety of so many bridegrooms seemed as just entering on the enjoyment of what they had been so long pursuing.

As soon as the whole was over, Mr. Pelham went to the King, and Lord Hervey to the Queen, to acquaint them with what had passed. When Lord Hervey at his first coming into the room shook his head and told her the numbers, the tears ran down her cheeks and for some time she could not utter a word; at last she said "*It is over, we must give way*; but, pray, tell me a

little how it passed." Lord Hervey said, that without any partiality he could assure her Majesty, in point of argument, reasoning, and good speaking, that the Court party had, without any comparison, entirely the victory in the debate;[3] but that he thought this no comfort, since the only inference to be drawn from it was, how determined our foes and how faltering our friends must be when in such a point the one could venture so strenuously to attack and the other were reduced so faintly to defend us; but he said it was not to be wondered at that the numbers of the opponents to this Bill should increase when everybody now believed that the majority of the King's Council had ranged themselves in that class, and that my Lord Bolingbroke's party at St. James's was more numerous than at Dawley.[4] "A great many in the King's service, Madam, are said openly to have declared themselves against this measure, and many more are thought to have taken the quiet part of lying by only till things are ripe for a revolution in the ministry, at which juncture it is expected they will break forth and show themselves not less inveterate enemies to Sir Robert Walpole than the others, though they have had a little

---

[3] All the prominent men at each side spoke:—

For the Petition.	*Against it.*
Sir John Bernard.	Sir Robert Walpole.
Mr. Sandys.	Mr. Horace Walpole.
Mr. Gibbon.	Mr. Winnington.
Mr. Bootle.	Solicitor-general Talbot.
Mr. Pulteney.	Attorney-general Yorke.
Sir William Wyndham.	Sir William Yonge.
Mr. Plumer.	Mr. Henry Pelham.
Mr. Heathcote.	
Mr. Wyndham.	

[4] Bolingbroke's country-house.

more caution in appearing so;" but thus much Lord Hervey said he would venture to affirm, that neither Sir Robert Walpole nor any minister who should succeed him would ever be able to carry on the King's business upon that foot; for if the subordinate ministers were to play a safe game, by either underhand opposing or acting a lukewarm part in sustaining what was thought expedient for the King's service, in such cases, though the minister would always be the first sacrifice, yet the power of the Crown must in some degree suffer too; and what ruined the one must at the same time greatly distress the other. The Queen said he was certainly in the right; that discipline was as necessary in an administration as an army; that mutiny must no more go unpunished in the one than the other, and that refusing to march or deserting ought to be looked upon in the same light.

Whilst she was saying this the King (who had dismissed Mr. Pelham) came in, and the Queen made Lord Hervey repeat to the King all he had been saying to her. The King heard willingly, but that night said very little; he asked many questions, but was much more costive than usual in his comments upon the answers he received to them; however, when he asked Lord Hervey if he could remember some of those who had swelled the defection that day, as Lord Hervey repeated the following names, his Majesty tacked the following remarks to them:—Lord James Cavendish, "*a fool;*" Lord Charles Cavendish, "*he is half mad;*" Sir William Lowther, "*a whimsical fellow;*" Sir Thomas Prendergast, "*an Irish blockhead;*" Lord Tyrconnel, "*a puppy that never votes twice together on the*

same side."[5] There were more, which I have now forgot, but something in the same style his Majesty had to say on every deserter that was named. As soon as Lord Hervey was dismissed he went to supper at Sir Robert Walpole's, who had assembled about a dozen friends to communicate the resolution taken of giving up the Bill. After supper, when the servants were gone, Sir Robert opened his intentions with a sort of unpleased smile, and saying "*This dance it will no farther go*, and to-morrow I intend to sound a retreat; the turn my friends will take will be to declare they have not altered their opinion of the proposition, but that the clamour and the spirit that has been raised makes it necessary to give way, and that what they now do is not owning what they have done to be wrong, but receding for prudential reasons from what they still think as right as ever."

On this text he preached for some time to this select band of his firmest friends, and then sent them to bed to sleep if they could.

On the morrow [*11th April*], when the order of the day for the second reading of the Tobacco Bill was read, Sir Robert got up and, after a very long and artful speech, proposed the putting it off for two months. The anti-Excise party, not satisfied with this victory, but flushed with conquest, insolent in their success, and solicitous to push their triumph, said it was not sufficient to drop such a Bill in this soft manner; that so wicked an attack upon the liberties of British subjects ought to be treated in a different manner; that it ought to be stigmatized with every mark of ignominy that could be

[5] They had all originally voted for the Bill.

put upon it; that rejecting it in the most peremptory manner was the part which it became a House of Commons, jealous of the rights and tenacious of the liberties of the people, to act on this occasion; and that nothing less would appease the nation. Sir William Wyndham, therefore (who led the van of these florid declaimers on this popular topic), insisted on a previous question, whether the postponing question proposed by Sir Robert should be then put or not, and declared his reason for being against putting the main question then was, because he intended afterwards to move that of rejection.

But this conduct, though it did not weaken their triumph without doors, lost them many friends within; several of those who had been originally for the Bill and were now come to wish it laid aside, being much more desirous to carry that point without a division, than to be forced to appear against what at first they had so zealously espoused.[6] After a long debate, therefore, the opposing party, perceiving they had endeavoured to lead their new troops farther than they cared to advance, gave up the rejecting the Bill, and submitted without a division to the gentler method at first proposed by Sir Robert Walpole of postponing the farther consideration of it for two months.

The anti-Excise mob, who had filled the lobby and Court of Requests[7] rather fuller to-day than any other

---

[6] Twenty-seven Members who had supported the Bill changed their votes.—*Hist. Reg.*

[7] The Court of Requests was a large and very ancient hall of the palace of Westminster, subsequently appropriated to the House of Lords, who sat there till the fire of 1834. It has been, since that event, occupied by the Commons.

in which this affair had been under consideration, followed the example of their friends within doors, and with correspondent insolence in their demeanour greeted every member as he passed whom they knew to have been for the Excise with ironical thanks, hissings, hallooing, and all other insults which it was possible to put upon them without proceeding to blows.

Brigadier Churchill and Lord Hervey having run this mercantile gauntlet, had both (though separately) the same thought, and concluded the agreeable distinctions paid to them would naturally be heaped sevenfold on their friend and patron; they both, therefore, stemmed this torrent back again, returned into the House, told Sir Robert what had passed, and prepared him for what, if he would expose himself, he must expect to meet. They desired him to avoid it as he had done the first night, and go through Lord Halifax's; but he said there was no end of flying from such menaces, and that the meeting dangers of this kind was the only way to put an end to them, reasoning, perhaps, as Suetonius says Cæsar was thought to do when he was desired to avoid giving opportunity to conspirators against his life: "Insidias undique imminentis subire semel confessum satius essequam cavere semper" ("It is better once to confront danger than to be always avoiding it").

Surrounded, therefore, by Lord Isla, Lord Hervey, Brigadier Churchill, his son [Edward], two or three more friends, and two servants, he presented himself to these rioters, who made so great a disorder, notwithstanding the protection of this circle immediately round him, and in spite of a lane of forty or fifty constables,

who were placed there to secure every member a free and unmolested passage, that between the pressings of the mob to insult him and the zeal of the civil magistrates to defend him, there was such jostling and struggling, that had anybody fallen down they must inevitably have been trampled to death. The oaken sticks and constables' staffs were so flippant over the heads of friends and enemies, without any possibility of distinction, that many blows were given and received at random. But nobody of the Walpole faction was hurt or wounded excepting one, Mr. Cunningham,[8] a Scotchman, in the breast, Mr. Ned Walpole in the arm, and Lord Hervey on the forehead.

With much difficulty Sir Robert at last got to his coach and went home. Lord Hervey went to St. James's, stayed with the King and Queen two hours, and told them everything that had passed in the House, but said not one word of what had happened out of it, not knowing whether Sir Robert Walpole would think it most for his interest to complain of the injury or to sink the affront. Lord Hervey knew it would always be time enough to tell the story, but if once told there would be no recalling it; and therefore left it in Sir Robert's option to determine, as his own judgment and inclination should direct, whether it should be secreted or published.

The next morning early he went to Sir Robert Walpole to acquaint him with the silent part he had acted, and his reasons for it. Sir Robert thanked him ex-

[8] I presume Henry Cunningham, M.P. for Stirlingshire, "Commissary-General in Scotland,"—"who," says Tindal, "had the courage to draw his sword and keep off the mob till his friend escaped."

tremely, but said the resolution was taken to complain in the House of what had passed; and, pursuant to this resolution, this incident was so well managed, the insult to the House so artfully set forth, and every part so well acted by the dramatis personæ in this Parliamentary farce, that on the relation made first by Lord Hervey, then by Mr. Pelham, and then by Sir Robert Walpole to the House, this accidental scuffle was treated as a deep-laid scheme for assassination,[9] whilst the resentment against such proceedings was so well improved, and the whole thing taken up with so high a hand, that the House came *nemine contradicente* into three or four resolutions, that condemned, in the strongest terms, all actors, abettors, promoters, or encouragers of these riotous, tumultuous transactions; and, to crown all, a supplemental order was made by the House that the City members should carry copies of these resolutions to the Lord Mayor that he might communicate them throughout his jurisdiction. Sir John Bernard, one of the City members, having the day before declared that he wished this multitude at the doors of the House were ten thousand, and the citizens all along having fomented the riots and encouraged these applications to Parliament, it was particularly mortifying to them and their representatives to have their triumph on this occasion

[9] Horace Walpole, of course, adopted that version, but mistakes the night of the event. After mentioning a former not very probable design of having Sir Robert *murdered by a mob*, he proceeds: "Such an attempt was actually made in 1733, at the time of the famous Excise Bill. As the minister descended the stairs of the House of Commons on the night on which he carried the bill, he was guarded on one side by his son Edward, and on the other by General Charles Churchill, but the crowd behind endeavoured to throw him down, as he was a bulky man, and trample him to death; and that not succeeding, they tried to strangle him by pulling his red cloak tight, but fortunately the strings broke by the violence of the tug."—*Reminiscences.*

turned into a vote of censure; but as strong as the City party had been two days before in the House, the current was now turned, and the stream too strong against them for the rhetoric of any of their advocates and partisans to divert its course.

The illuminations, mobs, bonfires, and disorders that there had been in the City the night before, when Sir Robert Walpole, with a fat woman (meant for the Queen), were burnt in effigy, contributed almost as much as what had happened in the Court of Requests to exasperate every body against the conduct of the citizens.

The general cry was that the liberty of speech, the freedom of debate, and the very essence of Parliament were at an end if the House of Commons suffered itself to be actuated by any foreign influence whatever, or permitted anything but their own wisdom to turn the balance in their determinations; that much had been formerly said in debates on the Pension Bill how necessary it was to ward against the pecuniary corrupt influence of the Crown, but that the intimidating influence of a mob at the doors of the House, though the other extreme, was equally destructive of that authority and independence which the Commons ought to maintain, and which was essential not only to their dignity as part of the legislature, but essential also to the preservation of the constitution on the free and flourishing foot upon which it now stood.

Lord Hervey in his speech said, that if these insolent encroachments of the populace were suffered to grow and were given way to in this manner—if the opinion of the rabble was to be taken on the subject-matter of

everything debated here, and their clamour, and not our judgment, to make decisions—in a little time he should expect to see Acts of Parliament passed in London as the *Plebiscita*[10] were passed in Rome; and instead of the representatives of the people with decency and method considering what was proper and fit to be done, that he supposed he should see the Speaker at Charing-Cross or the Stocks-market proposing laws to a tumultuous mob, who, like the Roman plebeians, would enact, rescind, promulgate, and repeal, make, and break laws, just as the caprice of their present temper and the insinuations of their present leaders should instigate and direct. In short, this incident had given such a turn to the spirit of the Commons, that the Court party this day might have done whatever they would. But as this was the first time, so I believe one may venture to say it will be the last that ever a first minister found any advantage from being mobbed.

As it was universally believed that this riot was fomented by the upper sort of citizens, and put in practice by the inferior, so the names of merchants and traders that had all this winter, whenever they were mentioned, put the whole House in an uproar with zeal in their favour, had now lost all their virtue. The Commons, and the country gentlemen in particular, grew jealous of their own power, were afraid of the ill effects that might attend the letting any class of men in to share it, and began to think it was high time to curb that spirit which they had contributed to raise.

Besides this, as there were many who had been for dropping this Bill merely from apprehending the danger

[10] Laws passed by the people without the concurrence of the Senate.

of riot and clamour—many more who, without being enemies to Sir Robert Walpole, were against it from prudential views to their elections, and because they did not dare to be for it; so both these classes of people—the first from a desire to discountenance tumult, and the other from regard to him whom they had opposed with regret—were ready to join in any resolutions that should demonstrate their opposition to the Bill not to have been personal or to raise clamour, and that should show their dislike was to the project and not to the projector.

For a fortnight after the rejection of this Bill, nothing was heard of but rejoicings in all the great towns, and various indications of the people's enmity to the scheme and its abettors, as well as their joy on its miscarriage and their gratitude to its opponents. This joy was carried so far at Oxford, that for three nights together, round the bonfires made there, the healths of Ormond, Bolingbroke, and James the Third were publicly drank; and so much treason talked, and so many disorders committed, by the students as well as the townsmen, that the Vice-Chancellor's authority, joined to that of the civil magistracy, were hardly sufficient to quell the tumults.

These treasonable riots, and mixing the Crown in the present disputes, gave the friends of the minister an opportunity of saying that the Excise scheme was not the real cause of all the clamour that sheltered itself under that pretence, but that the disaffected to this Government took this occasion, and made that their plea, for raising disturbances and kindling feuds in the kingdom, by which they hoped to distress if not to overturn the Government.

CHAPTER X.

Walpole resolves to punish official mutineers—Lords Chesterfield and Clinton dismissed—Character of the other Ministers and Courtiers—The Prince of Wales and his Friends hostile—Walpole assembles his Party and harangues them—Triumph in the Commons—South Sea Question in the Lords—Deserters—Bishop Hoadley.

IN the mean time Sir Robert Walpole having experienced how dangerous it had been to suffer his enemies at Court to be talking and plotting against him with impunity, and to leave them at quiet in *their* employments whilst they were making him so uneasy in *his*, resolved to show that the lenity, indolence, fear, or policy that had hitherto prevailed so far as to make him acquiesce under such usage, was now at an end, and that he was able both to discern and punish all those who ventured to treat him in this manner. The first sacrifices made to these his new maxims of government were Lord Chesterfield and Lord Clinton.[1] The Duke of Grafton was sent from the King (the very next day after the House of Commons came to those resolutions concerning the riots) to demand the Steward's staff of the first; and one of the Secretaries of State was at the same time ordered to write to the last, to let him know the King had no farther occasion for his services either as Lord

[1] Hugh Fortescue, in whose favour the dormant barony of Clinton was called out of abeyance in 1721, and who was in 1746 created Earl of Lincoln. He died without issue.

of the Bedchamber or Lord Lieutenant of Devonshire.[2] It was as much a matter of wonder in the town, how so insignificant a creature as Lord Clinton, when he was dismissed from Court, could contrive to make himself considerable enough to be turned out, as it was at his entrance there how he had been thought of consequence enough ever to be taken in. A more moderate genius could not be found in all the hereditary possessors of ennobled folly throughout the whole peerage, his kinsman, my Lord Falmouth, not excepted. He was a man of a mean aspect, a meaner capacity, but meanest of all in his inclinations: his dialect and his whole conversation was a heap of vulgarisms, both as to sentiment and expression, and his only mark of thinking was his pursuit and love of money.

Lord Chesterfield wrote the King a letter next morning, of which he gave me the following copy.[3] The King sent him no answer; and Sir Robert Walpole, to whom the King showed it, and who did not know I had seen it, told me that Chesterfield had written the King a letter, extremely laboured, but not well done.

As to Sir Robert Walpole pushing out Lord Chesterfield, and at this juncture, he was certainly not to be blamed for it, since it was indeed full time for him, if he had power, to make some examples among those who distressed and opposed him at Court; for hitherto, in this reign, all his known ill-wishers faring as well as his friends,

---

[2] Sir Robert gave an additional proof of his Court favour and power by the appointment of his son, Lord Walpole, to the Lord Lieutenancy of Devon, *vice* Lord Clinton.

[3] This copy does not appear.

it became the interest of every one to be thought his foe, since without losing them anything in present, that character secured them a reversionary interest in case of a change with those who should succeed. As affairs now stood at Court, almost all the great offices and employments were filled up by men who, though they did not directly vote against the present measures, yet took the liberty of talking very freely against them; and neither had, nor desired to be thought to have, any great cordiality towards Sir Robert Walpole. The Dukes of Devonshire, Grafton,[4] and Newcastle were the only three I can name who either professed themselves his friends or acted as such—a triumvirate whose friendship was much more considerable from their titles and estates than from any assistance their judgment was capable of giving in private council, or their oratory in public assemblies. The two first were mutes, and the last often wished so by those he spoke for, and always by those he spoke to.

As to Lord Harrington, the other Secretary of State, he had reduced himself to a state of annihilation: he was absolutely nothing—nobody's friend, nobody's foe, of use to nobody, and of prejudice to nobody. There was something very singular both in this man's acquisition of fame and his loss of it; for when he was at the Court of Spain, without doing anything there that might not have been transacted by a common clerk, all parties

[4] Charles, second duke, born in 1683, now Lord Chamberlain—"a *pretty gentleman*," says Mackay—"a slobberer without one good quality," adds Swift.

at home flattered and courted him. People talked, heard, and read of nothing but Lord Harrington; and as soon as he came over, and was made Secretary of State, the sound of his name began to die away: he was forgotten in his eminence—seen every day, and never mentioned.

As for my Lord President of the Council, the contemptible Earl of Wilmington, he hated Sir Robert in his heart; and though he did not dare to speak against him himself, approved and caressed those that did; and if anybody else should have courage enough to attack him, or strength enough to pull him down, no man in England wished better success to such an undertaking than Lord Wilmington, or would be more ready to trample on Sir Robert if it prevailed.

The Duke of Dorset, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, was in the same situation and way of thinking as my Lord President. He hated Sir Robert Walpole, without having received any injury, and wished him out, without proposing any advantage from it; for let who would succeed him, the Duke of Dorset or Lord Wilmington could not be more, and in all probability would have been less. When Lord Chesterfield was turned out, he said people might imagine his conduct had been rash and indiscreet; but that if my Lord Wilmington and the Duke of Dorset had not acted like real knaves, he had not behaved like a seeming fool. This declaration, as well as many other occurrences at that time, made people imagine that these two men had given great hope, if not strong assurances, to the opposing party, that when matters were ripe for a revolt they would join them.

The Duke of Argyle,[5] who was at this time Master of the Ordnance, Governor of Portsmouth, and had a regiment of horse, was not better satisfied than the rest. As he was an ambitious man, he envied Sir Robert Walpole; as he was a military man, he disliked him; and as a Scotchman, he hated him. His pride made him detest the possessor of any power superior to his own; and as the opinion of his own weight and merit, joined to an insatiable avarice, made him think he never could have his due in honorary employments or enough in lucrative ones, so he was always asking and always receiving, yet never obliged and never contented.

The Duke of Bolton's being out of humour, and Sir Robert Walpole's declared enemy, considering what he held from the favour of the Court under this administration, would have been more extraordinary than all the rest, if it had not been for that great and common solution for the many otherwise unaccountable riddles in people's conduct, which was his being a great fool; but this explains a multitude of difficulties in judging of multitudes of people, as well as the Duke of Bolton, for when one can once, without hesitation, pronounce a man absolutely a fool, to wonder at any of his actions afterwards, or seek a reason for them, is only putting oneself in his class; and I am no more surprised to see

[5] John, second, and usually called the great, Duke of Argyle, celebrated by Pope—

> "Argyle the state's whole thunder born to wield,
> And shake alike the senate and the field."

But, on the other hand, Lord Hervey's testimony seems to corroborate the judgment passed on him in the notes to the *Suffolk Correspondence*, that there was reason to suspect "that this great duke was, in his political life, but a petty intriguer, a greedy courtier, and a factious patriot."—vol. ii. p. 119.

an interested fool act against his interest, than I am to see a blind man go out of his way. The Duke of Bolton was at this time Governor of the Isle of Wight, Ranger of the New Forest, and had a regiment; yet with all this the Duke of Bolton was not satisfied, for being as proud as if he had been of any consequence besides what his employments made him, as vain as if he had some merit, and as necessitous as if he had no estate, so he was troublesome at Court, hated in the country, and scandalous in his regiment. The dirty tricks[6] he played in the last to cheat the Government of men, or his men of half-a-crown, were things unknown to any Colonel but his Grace, no griping Scotsman excepted. As to his interest in Parliament by the members he nominally made there, these were all virtually made by the Court, as they were only made by him in consequence of the powerful employments he held from the Court.[7]

In all this Excise affair the Prince in public acted a silent, quiet part; and Dodington, as his first minister, followed an example which in all probability was set him by his own dictates. However, by Dodington's never speaking in the House for the Excise, and by Mr.

---

[6] This is alluded to in one of the satiric ballads attributed to Sir C. H. Williams—

"Now Bolton comes with beat of drums,
Though fighting be his lothing,
He much dislikes both guns and pikes,
But relishes the *clothing*."

[7] Coxe places at this time, and to the *immediate* account of the Excise scheme, the dismissal of the Dukes of Bolton and Montrose, and of the Lords Burlington, Marchmont, Stair, and Cobham; but we shall see that these dismissals (though no doubt originally influenced by the opposition of those Lords to the Excise) took place somewhat later, and on a different point.

Townshend[8] (domestic favourite and Groom of the Bedchamber to the Prince) voting against it, and by the distinctions the Prince showed on all occasions to Lord Cobham, Lord Stair, Lord Chesterfield, and all that were the most violent against this scheme, it was not difficult to guess what his Royal Highness's opinion of it was, or which way his wishes pointed. The King, as Sir Robert Walpole told me, made him the offer of obliging the Prince to turn out Mr. Townshend, which Sir Robert refused. He at the same time told me, that if it were not for fear of making a breach between the King and his son, he both could and would turn out Dodington; "for this," added he, "is the second time that worthy gentleman has proposed to rise by treading upon my neck."

But notwithstanding this disposition of most of the great officers of the Crown towards Sir Robert Walpole, and notwithstanding the unpopularity which all ministers incur who have been long vested with power—notwithstanding the particular run against him in the country on account of the Excise scheme, and notwithstanding his defeat in the prosecution of it in Parliament—yet the absolute declaration of the Crown in his favour, by these early and explicit marks (the dismissions of Lord Chesterfield and Lord Clinton), saved the Ministry; for this put a damp on people's expectations of a change, which expectations, joined to the clamours of the disobliged, and the vigorous attacks of those who reckoned

[8] Colonel William Townshend, third son of Charles Viscount Townshend. He had also the lucrative office of Usher of the Exchequer, which, on his death in 1738, Sir Robert gave to his son Horace, and that with two or three other smaller sinecures made him an income of above 6000*l.* a year. —*Quart. Rev.* vol. lxxiv. p. 399.

themselves *next oars*, would, without this express declaration of the Crown to support Sir Robert, have infallibly got the better of him.

Many thought that the Queen imagined her power with the King depended at this time on her being able to maintain Sir Robert Walpole, consequently that she looked on his cause as her own, and thought their interests were so inseparably interwoven, that whatever hurt the one must strike at the other; but these conjectures were mistaken: the Queen knew her own strength with the King too well to be of this opinion, or to apprehend the loss of her power would have been the consequence of the loss of his. The future Ministry would certainly have been of her nomination, in case of a change, as much as the present, and if they had subsisted, as much at her devotion, for had she found them less so, their reign would not have been long.

But it is very probable her pride might be somewhat concerned to support a minister looked upon in the world as her creature, and that she might have a mind to defeat the hope Lady Suffolk[9] might have conceived of being able to make any advantage of the King's seeing himself reduced by the voice of the people to dismiss a man whom her private voice had so long condemned. Besides this, both the King and the Queen were possessed with an opinion that Sir Robert Walpole was, by so great a superiority, the most able man in the kingdom; that he understood the revenue, and knew how to manage that formidable and refractory body, the House of Commons, so much better than any other

[9] Mrs. Howard had become Lady Suffolk in 1731.

man, that it was impossible for the business of the Crown to be well done without him.

However, the Opposition having gained this victory over him and his Excise scheme, notwithstanding the obstinacy of the Court in maintaining him, thought they should still carry their point and force the Court to give him up, provided they could show the King that the representatives of the people were as much against this man in their hearts as the people themselves, and that the Parliament was not better inclined to him than the mob.

In order to effect this, a motion was made in the House by the Opposition for appointing a committee of one-and-twenty persons to be chosen *by ballot* to examine into the frauds committed in the Customs.

This motion Mr. Pelham unwarily gave into; for the very same people to deny a committee being appointed to examine into these frauds, which, to justify the Excise scheme, they had represented so notorious, was certainly impossible; but what the Court party ought to have insisted on was, that this committee should be a committee of the whole House—they ought to have stuck to that, and not at this juncture to have trusted the determination of so important an affair to the dark juggle of a ballot.

The consenting to this motion was an imprudence in the Court party, but not a greater than that committed by those who might have reaped the advantage of it; for when this ballot was agreed to, the opponents, instead of lying by for this battle in masquerade, which was to be fought the week after, led their troops to fight in the interim with bare faces on a petition from the druggists

to relax the Excise laws, on which question the anti-courtiers were beaten by a majority of 250 to 100.

I shall say nothing more on what passed previous to this ballot, or what was thought of it, or what was expected from it, because I cannot explain it better than by giving a copy of Sir Robert Walpole's speech to the Whigs, who, the night before this ballot, were all summoned to a meeting[10] at the Cockpit, in order to agree on the list that should be sworn in by them the next day. As I only took this speech down from my memory, and never saw one word of it but that night at the Cockpit, it will be very imperfect, and must want much of the energy and many of the ornaments with which it was pronounced. I begged Sir Robert to give me a copy, but he assured me, upon his word and honour, that he had never put one syllable of it in writing.

Sir Robert Walpole's Speech.

"Gentlemen,—The reason of your being assembled here is to consider of a ballot appointed for to-morrow, to choose a committee to examine into the frauds and abuses in the Customs to the prejudice of trade and diminution of the Revenue. These are the words of the Resolution of the House on Thursday, and this the pretence for appointing this committee. The true reason of this question having been proposed to the House nobody in this company, and few people out of it, I believe are at a loss to guess. Late incidents in Parliament have so flushed those who generally differ in opinion with this company, with

[10] This is no doubt the meeting which Coxe, and after him Lord Mahon, on the authority of Mr. White, M.P. for Retford, state to have been held previous to abandoning the Excise scheme. Mr. White's memory certainly failed him: there was no meeting about the Excise scheme, when it would have been useless, if not mischievous; and there was on this ballot, when it became necessary to rally every individual vote of the party.

such hopes of success, and put them upon pushing what they call their triumph so far, that their common and open boastings are, that they had but to procure this ballot to show all the world that though they always voted in a minority barefaced, yet whenever there should be an opportunity for the majority to show their hearts and their sentiments without restraint, that all mankind would then perceive that the present measures were as much disapproved by those who were forced from secret and indirect influence to give a sanction to them, as by those who always avowedly and openly appeared in opposition to them. If I said this was their only view, I should misstate the case, because I believe they did think that those who generally differ from them might possibly have done so in this proposition, and that then it would have appeared in the votes throughout all the kingdom that those concerned in the Government and called the Court party, after pretending to set a scheme on foot for the correction of fraud which they had so loudly complained of, did, as soon as inspection into those frauds was proposed, refuse to come into that proposition, and put a negative upon it; the consequence of which would have been, that the worthy gentlemen, who have made it their business to traduce and defame those concerned either in forming or promoting this scheme, would have said it was very plain from the proceeding, that the frauds were not so great as, to serve the present turn, they had been represented; or that in reality the design of those who had complained of them was not to apply a remedy to them. This was the consequence they hoped from the proposal if it was rejected, and the other was the advantage they expected to make of its being received. Designing, therefore, to avail themselves of the ferment in which they had put the nation, and reluctant to let that dangerous storm they had so industriously blown up subside, this question was, at a general meeting of their amphibious party, proposed and agreed to. When it came to be offered in the House, whether it was from accident, from surprise, or from judgment, that it was given in to, I shall not inquire, nor is that inquiry material, or the subject of your present consideration; but when it passed *nemine contradicente*, they did flatter themselves their party was

so strong in the House that they should be able to carry their list modelled and filled up in what manner they thought fit. Their lists, therefore, were settled and agreed to that night, and given out in the House next morning. Elate with what had already happened, and sanguine in the expectation of what was to happen, they had already given out that the indiscretion of their adversaries in permitting this pitched battle in masquerade, had fixed their victory and your defeat, and they still (vainly, I hope) imagine that you are to be tricked or cajoled into a Declaration, under your own hands, that for the six years that this Parliament has sat you have been constantly aiding, abetting, avowing, and supporting men and measures, which you were glad of the first opportunity to prove you thought ought not to be encouraged or pursued, and that you would show you disapproved the one and wished destruction to the other. This, if they were to carry their list, must and will be the interpretation put upon your conduct; and the next step they will take will be to arm this committee with such powers as shall throw the conduct of everything into the hands of those who compose it, and, consequently, delegate the whole sway and authority of the House of Commons to the particulars of this list. However, the ill success of the druggists' petition made them repent their precipitation in publishing their list, and showed them they had flattered themselves and proceeded on a deception, when they thought they were strong enough to carry that list in the manner it now stands, and that the complexion of this Parliament was enough changed to desire to fight under the banner of such leaders. When I have said this, Gentlemen, I desire you would cast your eyes on that list, and examine one moment the names of which it is composed: there are ten of the highest denomination of Tories, ten discontented Whigs, and one who has acted so often in both these characters that it is hard to say what it is. The conjunction and union of such men, almost as different in their views and principles from one another as from those to whom I am speaking, shows plainly, that to break into the Whig party and overturn the present system of Government, there is nothing that any of these opponents will not do, and that there is no associa-

tion they will not enter into, though never so unnatural, to prosecute that main point and play the power out of the hands in which it is at present lodged into those where they wish to place it. But let not the firmness and resolution of your adversaries so far surpass yours, as to make it appear that they have virtue and abilities to attack you with, which you want for your defence; let them see they have to do with such as are neither blind to the designs of their enemies nor to the paths of their own interest; that you have too great a regard for the peace and prosperity of your country to commit the care of it to such heads; that you do not desire to consign the Government of this kingdom to a set of men, half of which, if they act on any principles, act on a principle to overturn the Government, whilst the other half are at least ignorantly promoting the ends and playing the game of the enemies to that Government and Establishment to which they profess themselves well-wishers and friends, and have no way left to excuse their conduct, whilst they are every day and every hour consulting with Jacobites, taking directions from Jacobites, and promoting Jacobite measures, but barely professing that they mean no advantage or assistance to the Jacobite cause; and consequently reduce their behaviour to this option, that they must either confess they have been overreached and induced to do what they do not mean, or that they do really mean that which they dare not own.

"This, Gentlemen, is the true state of the present case and the true character of this motley party you have to deal with: patriotism is the preamble to all their harangues, patriotism is the rudder by which they pretend to steer all their actions; but the contention of this ballot is in plain and intelligible language for dominion, for dominion between Whigs and Tories, and the sole design of it is to feel the pulse of this Parliament, whether they wish for a change or not: and though some may pretend the contest lies between contented and discontented Whigs, yet let anybody examine the adverse list; let them see whether it is composed of discontented Whigs or equal parts of Tories and such as call themselves Whigs whilst they are doing all the work of those who profess quite contrary principles; let them reflect who, in the unnatural assemblage of this opposition, has

taken the lead in all debates and in all measures—Whig or Tory? let them consider *who* has dictated and *who* has governed whilst they have been the minority,[11] and, consequently, who would govern were they to become the majority; let Gentlemen, I say, reflect on these few self-evident truths, and then let them say whether the present contention for power is between Whigs and Whigs, or between Whigs and Jacobites.

"Nobody can imagine that the Whigs in opposition could be so weak as not to know that some names inserted in this list would do them more hurt, and fight our battle more strongly, than any arms we could provide for ourselves. How then came they inserted? Why, the Jacobites insisted, and the Whigs were forced to give way; and if in these preliminaries to dominion, if in these dawnings of power (as they call the present incidents, and believe them to be), if in this first step, I say, the Jacobites assumed authority and carried their point, can it be imagined but what they were able to do in a list for this committee, they would be able to do in a list for an administration; and if they found themselves at the helm there, does anybody that hears me want to be told what must become of the Whig cause, party, and principles? What must become of all the Revolution measures that have been pursued with so much steadiness and maintained with so much glory for above forty years? What must become of this Government and this Family, and the true freedom, liberty, welfare, and prosperity of this country?

"I shall avoid everything that is personal as far as I can; as for myself, I am but one, and what becomes of one man is of very little importance to the public or to any class of men; but as I have always fought on Whig principles, I will never desert them; as I have risen by Whigs, I will stand or fall with them; if I am not to be supported or cannot be supported by them, I scorn to ask or take support from any other party; and I will never condescend to seek refuge among those to whom I have

---

[11] He means Wyndham and the Jacobites—and above all, Bolingbroke.

so often bid defiance; it is in Whig principles I have lived, and in Whig principles I will die; it is by the assistance and favour of Whigs, joined to a great deal of undeserved good fortune, that I am raised to the height where I now stand; in gratitude I have always to the utmost of my power obliged, maintained, and favoured that party to whom I could give nothing, because I owed everything; and to whom, if my situation enables me to be useful and serviceable, I was not conferring obligations but paying debts, and returning those kindnesses which I had first received. I am now therefore, Gentlemen, not pleading my own cause, but the cause of the Whig party; I entreat you for your own sakes, for the sake of this Government and this Family, for the sake and for the cause of liberty, to exert yourselves with spirit and with unanimity on this occasion, that you may defeat and render abortive the scheme of those malevolent spirits that for want of hope and prospect of success have been long dormant, and have now taken this favourable opportunity, as they think it, to break forth: but with you it lies, and in your power it is, to disperse these hopes as fast as they gather, and to render that assistance ineffectual with which the rage, malevolence, disappointment, and revenge of some deserters from your cause have furnished these common enemies of this party, this country, and this establishment.

"I have often borne the reproach of many here present for having been instrumental in opening the spring to all the disturbances that have for some years last past overflowed this kingdom—I mean, for contributing to the restoration of one [Bolingbroke] who has made the lenity, indulgence, and mercy of this country the means of working its disquiet, if not its destruction; who has returned such evil for the good he has received, that nothing less will content him than the ruin of those who prevented his, by softening the justice of an offended nation into mercy, and by converting its wrath into forgiveness. At the time that I contributed to this step taken by Parliament, matters were so circumstanced that the thing was unavoidable; I will not by a fruitless retrospect prove to you now, Gentlemen, that it was so; but give me leave to say so much in mitigation of this *much repented fault of mine*—so much in excuse of the share and part

I had in this measure; that my reason for submitting to it was, that I did not then believe it was possible for any individual in human nature to be entirely devoid of all shame, truth, or gratitude, and unless the man I mean, and whom I need not name, had been so, and proved himself so, the consequences that have followed from this error committed at that time in his favour could never have happened. But let not those by whom I am blamed on this head be so inconsistent with themselves as to lodge additional power in those hands which have already abused the favour of their former benefactors; and do not you blindly and inconsistently contribute now to let the Legislature by proxy receive laws from him, whose crimes have made you divest him of that share which the Crown once thought fit to give him in all the deliberations of Parliament.

"I need say no more, I believe, to induce you to reject a list of his nomination; and all I will add in commendation of this now put into your hands is, that to execute the purpose mentioned in the Resolution no men can be fitter than your own friends. That the twenty-one here named are no more fit for this distinction than every one of those to whom I am speaking, I readily allow; that you are all equally worthy of having your names there, is certain; but since it is necessary, by the nature and circumstances of this affair, that only twenty-one should be selected, and that the success of the whole depends on your unanimity on this occasion, I do hope and desire that none upon any motive whatever will garble this list, or alter any name in it, but that you will all be firm, true, zealous, and unanimous."

This speech had so good an effect on those to whom it was addressed, that for two or three days there seemed to be a resurrection of that party spirit which had so long been dormant, that most people imagined it was quite extinct; and the next day in the House, where the industry of both parties had contributed to bring above five hundred members, the Court list was carried

by a majority of ninety,[12] most of the lists on both sides being entire.

This was the decisive and final stroke in the House of Commons this Session, for the day after this ballot-struggle was over most of the members decamped into the country.

However, as there had been a strong party made against the ministry in the House of Lords, in case the Excise Bill had come there, those who had been at the trouble of working this defection, since they were disappointed of showing their strength and the good effects of their cabals on that occasion, began to look out for some other point to squabble upon.

An inquiry into the state of the South Sea Company was the subject chosen, and the reason of its being chosen was Lord Scarborough's having declared the last year that as there were great murmurs in the world against those who had been concerned in the management of the great moneyed companies, and doubts arising in the minds of the proprietors with regard to the value of their property there; that in order to ease those doubts, to quiet the clamours, and let people know what they had to depend upon, whenever a scrutiny of these matters should be proposed by Parliament, he should be strenuously for it, and if any fraud was proved on those who had been intrusted with the management of any of these companies, that no one should go farther than he would towards the punishment of such delinquents

[12] The highest name on the Court list had 294 votes, and the highest on the Opposition 209. 18 of the Opposition and only 10 of the Courtiers varied any name in the lists.

and procuring satisfaction to those who had been defrauded.

This declaration was casually and digressively thrown out by Lord Scarborough, when the affair of the Charitable Corporation was under consideration the year before; but it was too explicit not to pin him down when anything of this nature should be proposed, to be for it.

The true and short state of this Company was this:—The annual ship, trading to the South Seas by virtue of the treaty with Spain, was, by that treaty, confined to be of a measure not exceeding 500 tons; whatever, therefore, she carried beyond that measure was an infraction of the treaty and forfeiture of the privilege allowed by it. But as the Directors of the South Sea Company found means to evade this treaty by carrying on a clandestine and illicit trade, so they cheated Spain by carrying merchandise and effects to a greater weight than they had a right to do by treaty; and they cheated the Company by selling the goods of their own private trade first, and leaving those of the Company to be disposed of at any price that could be got for them after the best of the market was over. Besides this, if any goods were damaged, or any were left unsold, or if any loss whatever was sustained, it was always put to the account of the Company, by which means the Company was never any year the better and was often the worse for having any trade thither at all.

This was so great a hardship upon the proprietors of the 16,000,000*l.* of South Sea stock (for that was their capital), that it was not wonderful they should complain. The reason the ministry gave for opposing inquiry into

the affairs of the Company (though they did not pretend to be ignorant of the facts) was, that though a scrutiny of this nature might be a private benefit to the proprietors of the stock, yet it would be a national loss, and consequently that it was not advisable for the legislature to unveil all this scene of mingled iniquity, but to let their national policy prevail over their personal justice, and permit a set of annual rascals to cheat the Company without being punished, in order to let England cheat Spain without being discovered.

But besides this particular reason Sir Robert Walpole had another general one (and the weakest part of his character and policy in my opinion), which was on all occasions, let the wrong be never so extensive, or the circumstances of it never so flagrant, to oppose all Parliamentary inquiries. He pursued this maxim from a fear of making this retrospective manner of inquiry, by the frequency of it, so familiar to Parliament, that one time or other it might, in any reverse of fortune and by the rage of party, affect himself, his family, and posterity; but by too strict an adherence to this principle he was often smeared with the filth of other people, and gave his enemies occasion to say that whoever had a mind to plunder the public or defraud particulars, they had but to keep out of the reach of the slow, uncertain hands of Westminster Hall, and let the notoriety of their crimes be never so manifest or the nature of them never so enormous, they would be secure of protection in Parliament whilst Sir Robert Walpole had any power there. His conduct in the affair of the Charitable Corporation, his opposition to a Bill for vacating the fraudulent sale of Lord Derwentwater's estate (by which the

trustees for the sale of forfeited estates had cheated the public of an immense sum and by acting in flat contradiction to an Act of Parliament); his doing all he could to prevent the Parliament taking cognizance of the frauds committed by the Directors of the York Buildings Company, and his having actually put a stop to this inquiry into the South Sea affairs in the House of Commons, had given but too just grounds for these reflections to be thrown out against him, and left his friends too little room to justify him when his adversaries represented him as the universal encourager of corruption and the sanctuary of the corrupt.

But all his power was not sufficient to prevent this inquiry in the House of Lords. In the first place the objections against a general inquiry for prudential reasons with regard to Spain were of no weight to stop the inquiry now proposed by the House of Lords, because the clandestine trade carried on by the Directors in the annual ship was not the point the Lords proposed to go upon. The inquiry they proposed was to see in what manner the money arising from the sale of the forfeited estates of the South Sea Directors in 1720 had been disposed of; and whether the trustees, in the disposition they had made of it, had observed the rules prescribed by that Act of Parliament that gave the produce of these estates to the proprietors of the South Sea stock. In the next place, this objection being removed, the curiosity of mankind, the natural propensity of Parliaments to inquiry, and the defection on the Excise scheme, and the pride of the young Lords, who had heard their whole body so long treated as ciphers, all combined to strengthen the party for going into this

business, and filled the nets that had been spread by the opponents to catch these deserters; among which, besides those I have already mentioned, were—the Duke of St. Alban's, one of the weakest men either of the legitimate or spurious brood of Stuarts; the Duke of Manchester, one as like him in his degree of understanding as of quality; Lord Pomfret, Master of the Horse, who pretended to be guided by his conscience in voting on an account he did not understand; Lord Falmouth, a blundering blockhead, who, in the two most material questions in this affair, spoke on one side and voted on the other, which gave occasion to some laughers to say that Lord Falmouth was determined to do the ministers all the hurt he could, for he spoke for them and voted against them; Lord Onslow ditto; and the Duke of Kent, who had been a Yes-and-No hireling to a Court for forty years, and took it into his head at threescore to turn patriot. There were more, but none either of note or of any more consideration than all other ciphers are, which, though ciphers, increase materially every number to which they are added.

One other considerable deserter there was (whom I had almost forgot to mention), who became such on the disposal of Lord Chesterfield's staff to the Duke of Devonshire—this was Lord Burlington, then Captain of the Band of Pensioners, who, having solicited the Steward's staff, and being refused it, threw up his own together with the Lieutenancy of Yorkshire and Vice-Treasurership of Ireland, and listed himself immediately in the Opposition. It was at first reported about town that Lord Burlington declared his resignation did not proceed from any dislike to the measures of the Adminis-

tration, or any quarrel with the ministers, but that his sole objection was to the King, who had told him a lie and broke his word, having promised him the first white staff that should be vacant, and yet given this to the Duke of Devonshire. The fact, I believe, was that the King, on giving Lord Burlington the Pensioners' staff, had said he hoped soon to put one into his hand that would be better worth his acceptance, which compliment Lord Burlington understood, or pretended to understand, as an absolute promise of the next white staff that should fall, and for the non-performance of this supposed promise he quitted the King's service; but though in great wrath he threw up all his own employments, yet he suffered his wife[13] (who was Lady of the Bed-chamber to the Queen) still to keep hers, which made his conduct doubly simple, the first folly being to quit his own post without juster offence, and the second, when the first was committed, to let my Lady retain hers. Her desiring to do so did not proceed from too little pride, or the weakness of her resentment of her Lord's usage, but from a stronger passion of another kind: she liked the Duke of Grafton, and had she left the Queen she must have left her lover, or at least have lost many favourable opportunities which her employment gave her of seeing him and which her own ingenuity more than her lover's assiduity always improved. My Lady, therefore, choosing rather to mortify her pride than her inclination and sacrificing the great lady to the woman, consulted her heart and not her character, her lover and not her husband in this difficulty, and whilst she laud-

[13] Dorothy Saville, daughter and co-heiress of the last Marquis of Halifax.

ably in reality gave up everything to her passion, she seemed so meanly to have considered only her pin-money and her interest.

When the Duke of Devonshire was made Lord Steward, Lord Lonsdale[14] succeeded him in the employment of Privy Seal, which was a great mortification to all the Opposition, who had always reverenced Lord Lonsdale as a sort of political idol, and looking upon him as their own, had always spoken of him as a man of such rigid virtue and so true a judgment, that whatever measures he abetted he must approve, and whatever he approved must be right. He was certainly an honest and a sensible man; but his integrity inclined him now and then to be whimsical, and his understanding to be rather too disputative.

---

[14] "Henry Lowther, last Viscount Lonsdale of the first creation, was made Constable of the Tower and Lord Privy Seal, which he resigned without going into Opposition. He was of very conscientious and disinterested honour—a great disputer—a great refiner—and a great genius." —*H. Walpole.*

CHAPTER XI.

Efforts of the Court to obtain a Majority in the Peers—The Queen and Bishop Hoadley—Marriage of Princess Royal—Portrait of the Prince of Orange—Dissatisfaction of the Prince of Wales—Defeat of Ministers in the Lords on the South Sea affair—The Opposition go too far—Are checked, and sign offensive Protests—Lord Hervey called to the House of Peers—The Session closes, and the Court goes out of Town.

BETWEEN the time when it was debated whether the House of Lords should call for papers and enter at all into the examination of the state of the South Sea Company, and the day fixed for the taking this matter into consideration, many Lords were *closeted, schooled,* and *tampered with* by the ministers, some by the King and more by the Queen. Among the latter was Hoadley, Bishop of Salisbury, whom she had sent for merely on suspicion, for he had never left the Court in any one vote, nor altered his public conduct, whatever he might have done in his private conversation. She told him that his enemies had been suggesting at St. James's that his affection for those for whom he used to profess the warmest attachment was quite changed, and that he had disapproved of everything that had been done lately, but particularly the Excise scheme; that he had been very slack in his attendance in the House of Lords this winter, and that most people talked of him as one whom the opponents expected every day to declare himself of the number of deserters. But as she was determined never to believe so improbable a story merely on the

credit of Court whispers, and that she thought the best way for people who wished and meant well to one another was always to have such misunderstandings explained before they gathered strength enough from repetition to grow into distrusts, so she had sent for him to let him know what she had heard, what many said, and what some believed.

The Bishop told her Majesty that he was extremely surprised and not less concerned to find it was possible for her to have given so much regard to such groundless and malicious insinuations as to think they wanted any further contradiction than their own improbability, or to imagine that after so many years spent in the service of her Majesty's family, and what was called the Whig cause, he should think it either for his credit or his interest in the close of his life to desert principles and men whom, in the most difficult times, he had always stood by and supported, manifestly against his interest on some occasions, and, if scandal and reproach can hurt a character, as much to the hazard of his reputation on others. He said if ever he had taken anything ill of Sir Robert Walpole, he could assure her Majesty he thought it would be convincing the world he had deserved to be neglected and ill-used by him, if he were capable of forgetting all the former obligations he had had to him, because Sir Robert had not added another to which, perhaps, he might think he had had some title;[1] he further added, that he thought Sir Robert Walpole the ablest and best minister the King could employ, and that, directly or indirectly, he had never

[1] Alluding to the disposal of Durham, *ante*, p. 147.

had the least correspondence with any one of those who were thought to be his rivals for power; that he had no opinion of their capacity, no esteem for their principles, and was far from approving of their conduct; that as to the Excise scheme, he always had and always should declare that he thought it a right one, intended for the good of the nation, and what would have proved so could it have been put into execution, but considering the light in which it had been represented to the people and in which they saw it, he had often wished that it had been dropped sooner; that Lord Hervey (with whom he had often spoken on this subject) could witness these to have been his sentiments, and to him he appealed for the truth of what he had now told her Majesty.

"Lord Hervey (the Queen said) is extremely your friend, and speaks of you always with the greatest esteem; but on this subject I have not yet talked with him, and I assure you it was not by Sir Robert Walpole I was told anything I have now said to you." The Bishop said, "I wish, then, your Majesty would have taken my justification from Sir Robert, since he was not my accuser; for Sir Robert must know that if I were knave enough to desire to bely all my professions and run counter to all my former conduct, I must be the weakest as well as the worst of mankind to throw myself now into the arms of a party to whom I must know I am not less obnoxious than he himself, and from whom I neither desire any favour nor can expect any quarter; and for my attendance in Parliament, he could have told your Majesty likewise that it has been as constant this year as any other of my life, though, from a very

bad state of health, no year of my life I have been less able to bear it." The Queen said she was extremely glad to hear this from his own mouth, for though she was too well acquainted with his worth to believe anything lightly to his disadvantage, "yet" (said she) "you know one is sometimes brought by one's own weakness and other people's wickedness to entertain suspicion of one's friends, which, in reason and justice, perhaps, one ought never to have given ear to."

The Bishop of Salisbury dined at Lord Hervey's lodgings the day after this conference, related it to him, and complained of Sir Robert Walpole, who undoubtedly, he said, had put the Queen upon talking to him in this manner, though she denied it; but he desired Lord Hervey to tell Sir Robert that he thought leaving any man or any party by whom one had been obliged, merely for not being more obliged, was so pitiful and dishonourable a part, that he might depend on him for any service he could do him as securely as ever, and that the more Sir Robert was pressed by his enemies and the harder things bore upon him, the surer he might be of any assistance he could give him.

Sir Robert Walpole went to see the Bishop soon after this, but behaved, as the Bishop told Lord Hervey, with a shyness, a coldness, and a reserve that he had never had about him till after the Durham affair, and which from the time of that incident he had never been without.

It was in this interval, before the South Sea debate came on in the House of Lords, that the King communicated by a message to both Houses the intended marriage of his eldest daughter, the Princess Royal, to

the Prince of Orange—a miserable match both in point of man and fortune, his figure being deformed[2] and his estate not clear 12,000*l.* a-year. It was, indeed, nominally double that, but the debts with which it was encumbered and other drawbacks reduced it to what I say. The turn, therefore, which good courtiers gave to this match, and which good subjects believed to be the case, was, that the father, for the sake of this country, and the daughter, to ingratiate herself with the people, had consented to take up with this marriage to strengthen on contingencies the Protestant succession to this crown, and renew an alliance with a family and a name always dear to this nation—an alliance from which this nation had formerly received many benefits, and from which it would not now be liable to incur those disadvantages which, if ever the crown should be this Princess's inheritance, might attend her being married to a greater prince, who should have larger territories of his own.

This sounded so well, that these fictitious merits were most eloquently displayed by all who spoke on this subject, either in the House of Lords or Commons, in order to make the fortune it was expected the Parliament should give, come so much the easier; but the true reason for this match was, that there was, indeed, no other for the Princess in all Europe, so that her Royal Highness's option was not between this Prince and any other, but between a husband and no husband —between an indifferent settlement and no settlement at all; and whether she would be wedded to this piece

[2] See post, p. 273.

of deformity in Holland, or die an ancient maid immured in her royal convent at St. James's.

On one side, her pride made her often reflect on the parting with her guards, and several other abatements of state consequential to this match; on the other, she was to consider, whenever her father died, what a disagreeable situation she would be in, dependent on her brother's bounty for a maintenance, and exposed to the mercy of a sister-in-law, who, she knew from her brother's weakness, could not fail of being both his mistress and hers. These considerations led her to that determination which, grounded on private and personal reasons, was to wear the countenance of national and popular motives, whilst the good people of England were to express their gratitude for what was no obligation, and to extol that conduct as an heroic sacrifice to their interest, which was in reality a well-weighed consultation and prudential concern for her own.

The fortune given her by Parliament was 80,000*l.*, which, like her mother's jointure, and not very unlike her father's Civil List, was just double what had ever before been given on the like occasion. There was upwards of that sum at this time lying in the Exchequer, arising from the sale of St. Christopher's,[3] and unappropriated by Parliament, which facilitated this generosity —the public on this occasion resembling some particulars who are much more willing to give out of their stewards' hands than out of their own pockets, and ready enough to assign what they do not see, though they cannot part with what they do.

---

[3] Sale *of lands* in the Island of St. Christopher's.

The Prince of Orange's figure, besides his being almost a dwarf, was as much deformed as it was possible for a human creature to be; his face was not bad, his countenance was sensible, but his breath more offensive than it is possible for those who have not been offended by it to imagine. These personal defects, unrecompensed by the *éclat* of rank or the more essential comforts of great riches, made the situation of the poor Princess Royal so much more commiserable; for as her youth and an excellent warm animated constitution made her, I believe, now and then remember she was a woman, so I can answer for her that natural and acquired pride seldom or never let her forget she was a Princess; and as this match gave her little hope of gratifying the one, so it afforded as little prospect of supporting the other.

There is one of two inconveniences that generally attends most marriages: the one is sacrificing all consideration of interest and grandeur for the sake of beauty and an agreeable person; and the other, that of sacrificing all consideration of beauty and person to interest and grandeur. But this match most unfortunately conciliated the inconveniences of both these methods of marrying, and consequently without the advantages of either; however, as she apprehended the consequences of not being married at all must one time or other be worse than even the being so married, she very prudently submitted to the present evil to avoid a greater in futurity.

The Princess Royal's personal beauties were a lively clean look and a very fine complexion, though she was marked a good deal with the small-pox; the faults of

her person were that of being very ill made and a great propensity to fat.

As those who had now the ear of the Prince of Wales lost no opportunity to irritate and blow him up against his father,[4] so this marriage gave them occasion to make his Royal Highness think it very hard that the first establishment provided by Parliament for one of the Royal progeny should be for any but the heir-apparent to the Crown. He was so very uneasy, that to everybody his looks told he was so, and to many his words.

The day the message was brought to both Houses it was whispered about that some friend to the Prince or enemy to the King would take this opportunity of making a proposal in the House of Commons to address his Majesty for the settlement of 100,000*l.* a-year to be made on the Prince, which, at the time the Civil List was given, everybody understood and had taken for granted was designed to be done as soon as he should come over; but nobody, when it came to the push, being either zealous enough for the service of the son, or desperate enough with the father to care to begin it, there was not the least mention made of this measure

[4] We are nowhere told, that I know of, what the original cause of difference was between George II. and Frederick Prince of Wales. It arose perhaps in some degree from the bad example given by George II. himself when Prince of Wales. Frederick was brought late, and on his father's part reluctantly, to England. There he fell into the hands of Opposition—always ready to speculate on the favour of heirs-apparent—and the King's displeasure, whatever was its original cause, would have been naturally and justly increased, if the story that Horace Walpole tells be true, that shortly after the Prince's coming over he was about to have secretly and suddenly married Lady Diana Spencer—a plot of her grandmother the old Duchess of Marlborough, which Sir Robert Walpole discovered in time to prevent.

in public, though it had been so much discoursed of in private. Nor was it in the least to be wondered at that this project should never be brought to execution: in the first place, because the danger every one ran of being betrayed who entered into any negotiation with his Royal Highness, made few people care to begin one; and, in the next place, because the instability of his conduct and the contempt that attended his character made him so little worth getting, that no wise or prudent man cared to run any risk for an acquisition that was likely to prove of so small a value and so short a duration.

When the great day [*24th May*] for the debate on the *South Sea affair* came on in the House of Lords, the numbers in the first division were equal [75]; but the debate being on a previous question, whether a question of the Duke of Newcastle's should be then put, and the rule of the House in that case being *presumitur pro negante*, this equality proved in effect a decision against the Court. The Queen seemed much more concerned at this defection and rebellion in the House of Lords than the King, and Sir Robert more so than either of them. The part he had to act was a very delicate and disagreeable one, for he knew the fatal consequences of such mutiny if unpunished, and yet was forced to be tender of urging to the King the necessity of further punishment, because he did not care to represent this defeat to him in so strong a light as that in which he saw it himself. Had he owned to the King that this was a point of that importance to the Ministry which he thought it, it is possible that the King's seeing a question so laboured as the Excise had been, go against his

Minister in the House of Commons, and this inquiry in spite of him brought into the House of Lords, might have made his Majesty imagine that Sir Robert's interest ran too weak in these two material assemblies to be long sustained. To the King, therefore, he treated this incident as a trifle, saying that it was of no importance to the Court which way it went; and that, as to *the revolters, he knew the reasons and the price of every one of them;*[5] but that the one was not worth considering, nor the other worth paying.

The truth was, Sir Robert made this a point of importance by meddling with it at all, for had he let it take its course, the Court or the Ministry could have been no way affected by it; but his having once shown a desire to keep it off, that alone made it necessary for him, if he could, to have done it.

But after this victory over him in the South Sea inquiry the opposing Lords fell into just the same error that the opposing Commoners had done in the case of the Excise Bill; for, not content with their first conquest, they aimed at extending it, and by that means lost part of the ground they had gained: they never carried a question after the first day, and by seasoning every one stronger and stronger, their numbers grew weaker and weaker, till on the last question [2*d June*], which was for appointing a joint committee of further inquiry into the South Sea Company's affairs, composed of twelve Lords and twenty-four Commoners, to be chosen

[5] This seems to corroborate an explanation of Horace Walpole's:—"It has been reported that Sir Robert Walpole had so bad an opinion of mankind, as to have said '*All men have their price.*' This is not the fact: what he said was, 'All *these* men have their price,' alluding to a particular case."—*Walpoliana.*

by ballot and to sit during the recess of Parliament, the desertion of the deserters was so great that they did not dare to stand a division.[6] However, they protested, and in so strong a manner, that it was hardly possible for words to make up a more severe invective on those who had opposed the appointment of this committee; but I believe it was the first instance on the books where a minority has been suffered in such plain terms to call a majority "a pack of ignorant corrupt slaves to an ignorant corrupt minister."

The two last articles of this protest were so very extraordinary, that I cannot help transcribing them :—

"Because the arts made use of to divert us from our duty and defeat this inquiry give us reasons to prosecute it with double vigour. For impunity of guilt (if any such there is) is the strongest encouragement to the repetition of the same practices in future times, by chalking out a safe method of committing the most flagitious frauds under the protection of some corrupt and all-screening minister."

"For these reasons we think ourselves under an indispensable obligation to vindicate our own honour, by leaving our testimonies in the Journals of this House, that we are not under the influence of any man whatsoever, whose safety may depend on the protection of fraud and corruption, and that we entered upon this inquiry with a sincere and just design of going to the bottom of the evil, and applying to it the most proper and effectual remedies."[7]

A resolution was once taken to expunge this protest, but Sir Robert declaring he had rather expunge the protesters, and most people being of opinion that unless the expunction could be carried by a great majority,

[6] It is stated in the Journals that there was a division, 75 to 70.

[7] It was signed by twenty-two peers, including most of those mentioned in the preceding pages as *deserters*.

the protest had better remain, this resolution was laid aside: had it been prosecuted, it would have certainly drawn them into new inconveniences; for the present temper and disposition of the House would not have permitted the Court to execute this design with a high hand; and had it been executed at all, it would not only have contributed to make the fame of it spread still wider, but given occasion to the entry of a second protest against the expunction, in which the first would have been recited, and which Lord Carteret (who drew the other) had declared he had ready to insert, and conceived in much stronger terms than its predecessor: so that the measure of expunction, besides prolonging the life of the thing it was intended to destroy, would have helped it to generate and produce an offspring yet more offensive than the parent.

This privilege of protesting with reasons is one which the Lords seem proud and fond of, but of all Parliamentary privileges, forms, customs, or institutions, it seems to me the most unaccountable and absurd, as it must always carry along with it a censure on the conduct of the majority of the House, and is generally nothing more than an authorised libel on the people then in power: by which means, if protests have any effect on posterity, they must have a bad one, supposing it to be of any consequence what future times think of the equity or wisdom of the former; for as they always urge the strongest reasons against what is done, without ever being compared with those on the other side, they must make every one in futurity who is unacquainted with the motives of the legislature for the laws they enacted, imagine they either did not understand the

interests of their country, or, from some mean corrupt views, sacrificed it to their own.

When the political day of judgment came for the disposition of rewards and punishments at the end of this Session, the signing this protest was looked upon as the sin which was not to be forgiven; accordingly, therefore, the Duke of Montrose and Lord Marchmont and Lord Cobham, the only three still left in employment who had been guilty of this irremissible sin, received letters of dismission the day after the Parliament rose. As Lord Cobham had nothing but his regiment that could be taken from him (his government of Jersey being for life), his disgrace made much more noise than that of the other two. Lord Stair's regiment was not taken, for two reasons: in the first place, because they had already divested him of the employment of Admiral of Scotland; and, in the next place, because without his regiment he must have starved; so that besides doubling the popular clamour upon breaking old officers for voting in Parliament (which was never approved of), the Court would have incurred the further odium of carrying their resentment to the utter ruin of those who had disobliged them, and, of course, drawn on the reproaches of all that numerous class among mankind who are always readiest to show their compassion to the oppressed by railing at the oppressor, and find a much greater pleasure in loading the one with reproaches than they would in administering relief to the other.

A little before the Parliament rose Sir Robert Walpole came to Lord Hervey and said he had so much business upon his hands that he begged of him to draw up a speech for the King to conclude the Session: Lord

Hervey did so.[8] But Sir Robert told him that this speech was full of *douceurs* to the Parliament, which he thought they did not deserve, and such as he was sure the King (though he were to be advised to it) would never consent to bestow upon them; and as to the conclusion, that flattery to the people (he said) was what the King at this time would as little submit to as the other. Lord Hervey said Sir Robert was a much better judge than he could pretend to be, either of what the King would do or what he ought to do; but that for his part he did not think these were times for any good to be expected from the King's huffing his Parliament or seeming out of humour with them; and that as to the people, considering the notions that had been infused into their minds, of the double attack made on their liberties by a standing army and the Excise, and considering the deep and general impression these suggestions had made on the minds of the people, that the King could not be too explicit in declaring all these suggestions entirely false and groundless, and that he was too careful of their interest and too sensible of his own ever to entertain a thought of ruling them but by the known and ancient laws of the Constitution.

Lord Hervey further added that if such sweetening declarations and little verbal cajoleries were ever expedient and proper to be made from the Throne to the

---

[8] Lord Hervey had here given in his MS. *his* project as well as the speech actually delivered: the former, which is very long, is hardly worth copying; it concluded with some commonplaces about "the liberties of the people being inseparable from the grandeur of the Sovereign," and, on the whole, only proves, notwithstanding Lord Hervey's paternal partiality for his own performance, that Sir Robert Walpole was in every way a much better writer of king's speeches than Lord Hervey.

people, they never could be more so than at present; and that though the King might be wrong-headed enough to feel a little reluctance from his pride to make such professions to his subjects, or think at first that it was bending too much or letting down his grandeur, yet he thought it would be very easy to show him that such sort of condescension might often contribute to advance the interest and strengthen the authority of the Crown by putting the people in good humour; whereas it being nothing more than the transient show of condescension, it could no more really cheapen his dignity than it could essentially hurt his prerogative.

Sir Robert, however, would not take this advice; the indignities that had lately been offered to him all over the kingdom, made him have a mind to draw the King in to show some resentment of them, and declare himself so little satisfied with this conduct, that he was not better pleased with his people than his people seemed to be with his Minister. He, therefore, drew up another speech, which the King spoke on the 11th of June, and was as follows:—

"My Lords and Gentlemen,—The season of the year and the dispatch you have given to the public business make it proper for me to put an end to this Session of Parliament.

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons,—I return you my thanks for the provisions you have made for the service of the present year. I have never demanded any supplies of my people, but what were absolutely necessary for the honour, safety, and defence of me and my kingdom, and I am always best pleased when the public expenses are supplied in a manner least burdensome to my subjects.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,—I cannot pass by unobserved the wicked endeavours that have lately been made use

of to inflame the minds of the people, and by the most unjust representations to raise tumults and disorders that almost threatened the peace of the kingdom; but I depend upon the force of truth to remove the groundless jealousies that have been raised of designs carrying on against the liberties of my people, and upon your known fidelity to defeat and frustrate the expectations of such as delight in confusion. It is my inclination, and has always been my study, to preserve the religious and civil rights of all my subjects; let it be your care to undeceive the deluded, and to make them sensible of their present happiness, and the hazard they run of being unwarily drawn by specious pretences into their own destruction."

Just before the Parliament rose Lord Hervey was called up by writ to the House of Peers [*9th June*], where there was so great a want of speakers, that the Court determined to make a recruit by next winter and began with this. Lord Cholmondely (formerly Lord Malpas), who was just come into the House of Lords by the death of his father, and was so vain as to think that the side on which *he* fought could want no reinforcement, did all he could to obstruct this promotion; and the Duke of Newcastle, who was simple enough not to be able to bear the receiving an assistance which the whole world knew he was simple enough to want, joined with Lord Cholmondely in this opposition; but Lord Hervey's interest at Court was at present too good for this point to be carried against him; for as the King and Queen had both a mind to have him in the House of Lords, and that Sir Robert had proposed it first to Lord Hervey without being solicited by him, it was impossible for Sir Robert, if he had been inclined to it, to go back. Besides, as Lord Hervey's pride and vanity were fed with the air of being called out of the

whole House of Commons upon this occasion, and as he had a mind to strengthen the interest of his family in Parliament by bringing one of his brothers into his place [at Bury], so he embraced this offer with too much readiness, and pushed the immediate execution of it with too much warmth, for the envy or ill-will of his adversaries to be able to stop it.[9]

The day before the Parliament rose [*12th June*] the three vacant Garters were given to the Prince of Orange, the Duke of Devonshire, and Lord Wilmington, and the day after it rose the Court went for a month to Richmond, where the King and Queen were always so much in private (and indeed the House would not allow them to be much in public) that they saw nobody but their servants.

From hence they went to Hampton Court, and soon after they came there the Duke of Bolton was dismissed from all his employments.[10] In the Government of the Isle of Wight he was succeeded by the Duke of

---

[9] This was a sudden resolution, not communicated to Lord Bristol, who had a strong feeling against Walpole and his administration, and, notwithstanding his general indulgence for, and admiration of Lord Hervey, disapproved this step. "As I am" (he writes from Ickworth 9th June, 1733) "a stranger to the many secret motives which must have influenced your choice so suddenly to exchange the important house you was a member of for so insignificant a one as your friend and you have endeavoured to make that you are to be translated to, I will not take upon me to determine whether it was on the whole well judged or not." Lord Bristol intimates his opinion that Lord Hervey, instead of submitting to be "*kicked up stairs*," should have had efficient office as a reward for the ability and zeal he had shown in the late arduous session.

[10] From a regiment of dragoons (given to the Duke of Argyll); the Lord-Lieutenancy of Hampshire (given to Lord Lymington); and the Government of the Isle of Wight. The dismissal of his Grace and Lord Cobham from their regiments made a great outcry. The great Lord Chatham was similarly dismissed from a cornetcy in 1736.

Montague, a man of little more consequence than his being a Duke, who had been long wavering between the Court and the Opposition, and took this opportunity to sell himself for full as much as he was worth, by getting the income of this employment increased to 1500*l.* a-year.[11]

---

11 There is here some erasure in the MS., and a page or two seems wanting. From the few words visible, it seems to have related to the increasing "coldness between the Prince and his parents," of which we shall see enough hereafter.

CHAPTER XII.

Affairs of Poland—Rival claims of the Elector of Saxony and Stanislaus Leczinski—The Emperor and the Czarina support the former, France the latter—Stanislaus elected by intrigue and violence—Approved by Lord Hervey and Walpole, but distasteful to the King and Newcastle—Stanislaus expelled, and Augustus elected—War between France and the Emperor—Treaty between France and Savoy—Opinion of George II. on it—The French seize Lorraine—Royal Hunting—Lord Hervey's intercourse and conversation with the King and Queen—Advocates neutrality: so does Walpole—Negotiation in London between the Emperor and Spain—Delays of the Emperor—Spain concludes with France—The Emperor loses Italy.

THE competitors for the crown of Poland, upon the demise of King Augustus [1 *Feb.*, 1733], were the Elector of Saxony [Frederic Augustus], son to the late King, and Stanislaus Leczinski, father to the Queen of France. Stanislaus had been formerly made King of Poland by Charles XII. of Sweden, when that madman deposed King Augustus, and, after the defeat of the King of Sweden, had been himself deposed by King Augustus, who again regained the crown of Poland and died in possession of it.

The Emperor [Charles VI.] on this occasion opposed the party of Stanislaus, and espoused that of the Elector of Saxony, for a double reason: the one was, to prevent France from having any interest in so near and powerful a neighbour; and the other, his desiring to set a Prince on the throne of Poland who would

enter into the guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction,[1] and this the Elector of Saxony had promised to do, though he had married one of the daughters of the Emperor Joseph, and consequently gave away by this guarantee all the right his wife might pretend to any share of the Austrian dominions; and as she was daughter to the elder brother of the present Emperor, her claim and that of the Electress of Bavaria, her younger and only sister, were certainly the strongest that could be pleaded in bar to the undivided succession of the eldest daughter to the present Emperor, on whom all that great inheritance, by this settlement of the Pragmatic Sanction, was to fall.

The Czarina joined with the Emperor in concerting measures to defeat the pretensions of Stanislaus and promote those of the Elector of Saxony. The interest Muscovy had in preventing Stanislaus from reascending the throne was for fear, as Sweden had formerly made him King, he might be inclined, or think himself in gratitude obliged, as soon as he became so again, to assist the Swedes in recovering what the Muscovites had taken from them by conquest and still retained, particularly *Livonia*, which was the loss under which they were the most impatient.

France had no other interest in this affair than the glory of presiding in it, increasing the grandeur of the father-in-law to her own King, and establishing a monarch in Poland, who, by the ties both of blood and

---

1 The *Pragmatic Sanction* was the settlement made by the Emperor Charles VI. in 1722 of his hereditary dominions upon his daughter Maria Theresa, which had been confirmed by the diet of the Empire, and guaranteed by England, France, and Holland, and most of the other powers.

gratitude, she was sure, in any future disputes that should arise in Europe, must always give her cause the preference and her interest assistance.

The Primate of Poland,[2] who had been gained by the money of France to the interest of Stanislaus, in his first step towards an election proposed an oath to be taken by all the Electors not to choose a foreigner. This oath, which, by the strength of the party of Stanislaus and the authority of the Primate, was forced on the people, entirely set aside the Elector of Saxony. The Emperor, therefore, and the Czarina ordered their ministers at Warsaw to protest against it, both of them pretending that it abridged the freedom of the Poles, who had a right to choose what King they thought fit, and for the maintenance of which freedom of election the Emperor said he was by treaty a guarantee. The Czarina went still farther, for she absolutely protested against the election of Stanislaus, who she insisted by a treaty now subsisting between Russia and Poland was for ever proscribed and made incapable of reascending the throne. When the Muscovite Ambassador at Warsaw made this protest to the Primate, he did it attended only with a few domestics, and at the same time told the Primate publicly, if the remonstrances were not listened to, that there were thirty thousand Russians then on the confines of Poland, who should penetrate his country, lay waste whatever they found in their way, march directly to Warsaw, and make their whole city a scene of blood, confusion, and ruin.

---

[2] The Archbishop of Gnesna, Primate of Poland (at this time Theodore Potocki), exercised, in right of that see, the sovereign authority of the State during any interregnum.

This defiance being thrown out at an assembly of the Poles, in a field where great numbers were met to consult on some point relating to the present critical juncture of affairs, the Muscovite Ambassador had like to have been murdered on the spot, and was with great difficulty rescued by his own train out of the hands of some warm partisans of King Stanislaus, who were already advanced to destroy him.

After these verbal representations and arguments, these two great powers, the Emperor and Czarina, proceeded to the *ratio ultima regum*, and prepared two great armies to march to the frontiers of Poland, the Czarina on the side of Lithuania and the Emperor on that of Silesia; whereupon France also marched sixty thousand men, under the command of Marshal Berwick, natural son to King James II. of England, to the banks of the Rhine, and threatened, if the Emperor entered Poland, or any way by force pretended to influence the election, that he himself should be immediately attacked, either by the siege of Luxembourg or in whatever quarter he should be found most vulnerable or most exposed.

The Emperor, finding that neither Holland, who had signed a treaty of neutrality with France, nor England, who did not care to be drawn into any dispute in this affair, would stand by him in the point he was pushing, began to think of retreating as fast as he could from the unadvised hasty steps he had taken. But the same thing happened in this occurrence among the great powers of Europe that often happens in private transactions among people of inferior rank, which was, that after beginning to dispute on a trifle, to which they

either were, or at least ought to have been, very indifferent, by little and little they worked themselves up to be so much in earnest, and each of them piqued themselves so much on that point of honour which everybody makes to himself of going through with what he undertakes, that all Europe was now upon the very verge of being embroiled in a war, which no one power in Europe was either inclined to or in a condition to undertake. France was drained of all her specie, which had been expended in corrupting the *Piastes*[3] at Warsaw, and Cardinal Fleury, both in principle and interest, was so much averse to a war, that nothing but the impossibility of avoiding it could bring him ever to consent to declare it.

The Emperor was still less disposed to it, having no money, his troops dispersed, and weak in every place where he had anything to maintain: he had been for two years evacuating Italy; he was able to make no opposition to the French on the Rhine; and was so destitute of forces, ammunition, provisions, and everything necessary to resist a siege in the Netherlands, that if the French had not known that neither the English nor the Dutch could suffer that barrier to be broken, they might have taken all he possessed in Flanders in half a campaign.

This Imperial bully, therefore, the series of whose conduct for several years past had always been either making promises he did not perform or throwing out menaces he did not dare to execute, now grew frightened, and that he might not give France an open handle

[3] *Piastus* was an old Polish sovereign and saint (A.D. 850), after whom *native* sovereigns and those who favoured that principle were called *Piastes*.

for attacking him, or a pretence for passing the Rhine, countermanded the marching those troops that were in Silesia, and ordered them not to advance towards Poland, but to keep in an absolute state of inaction.

But the Russians having already entered Lithuania, and continuing their march towards Warsaw, the French said that as the Russians were put in motion by the contrivance of the Emperor, and took their measures underhand in concert with him, so whatever impediment was made by the Muscovites to the election of Stanislaus, they should look upon it in the same light as if it were done by the Imperial troops, and consequently resent it accordingly.

In the meantime the French fitted out a squadron of fourteen men-of-war for the conveyance, as they pretended, of King Stanislaus to Dantzic, which fleet, to carry on the grimace,[4] actually sailed to the Baltic, as if he had been on board, whilst in reality he went incognito by land, and lay concealed in Warsaw till the day of election in the house of M. Monti, the French Ambassador.

Some time before the election another party began to gather strength in Poland—a party that was not for choosing either Stanislaus or the Elector of Saxony, but who proposed some third man to be taken, who should be a nobleman and native of their own, in order to avoid a scission (which is the term the Poles have to express an election decided by arms and not by voices).

[4] The Chevalier de Thiange, in the costume of Stanislaus, and in his coach, travelled to Brest, and there embarked under a royal salute, while Stanislaus, in a mean disguise and by many artifices, crossed Germany and Prussia, and arrived at Warsaw on the 8th of September, where he remained concealed till his election of the 11th.

Many people were of opinion that the Primate underhand encouraged this party, who were for choosing a *Piaste*, or noble native of Poland, hoping by that means to make the election fall on his own nephew; but whether this project was ever in his thoughts, or whether he only could not bring it to bear, is what I do not pretend to determine; though, considering the character of the man, I think the last conjecture the most probable.

When the day of election came [11*th September*], the Primate rode into the field, preceded by Poniatowski, Regimentary of the Crown, who harangued the nobles in favour of Stanislaus, and told them it was the only choice that could prevent a scission and preserve the tranquillity of the kingdom. Others said that the election of a *Piaste* only could have these effects, and put in nomination Prince Wisnowieski, Castellan of Cracow. Prince Lubomirski, Palatine of Sendomir, declared also against Stanislaus, and said to the Count de Tarlo, Palatine of Lublin, "You used to threaten death to any that should oppose Stanislaus in the field of election; if you dare to prosecute your threats, behold in me the man who opposes him and bids you defiance." The Starost Opoczinski went still further, and openly in the field of election said to the whole collected party of Stanislaus, "I speak in favour of liberty and against any election made in consequence of a restraining oath; and if this is being an enemy to my country, let him who thinks so strike me to the heart," in pronouncing which words he bared his breast and presented it to the stroke. But a little tumult arising upon it, and some of the party of Stanis-

laus advancing to take him at his word, he was hurried out of the field by some of his own suite, whilst the rest of his party put themselves between him and his assailants. Immediately after this all the Palatines who were against Stanislaus, finding they were likely to be overpowered, retired to the other side of the River Vistula, after which the Primate brought on the election, and Stanislaus was chosen; six people of condition who were against him, and had not retired with the rest, being cut to pieces on the spot for opposing him: notwithstanding which, the election was notified by the French minister at every Court in Europe as unanimous.

As soon as the election was over, the Electors, with the Primate and Regimentary of the Crown at their head, went to the House of the French Ambassador to acquaint Stanislaus with his being once more King of Poland, and pay their homage to their new sovereign; from thence he was conducted to the castle, with all those honours and acclamations generally given to royal idols when attended only by their own votaries.

But upon coming to the castle and looking out of the windows, when he saw how numerous the party appeared that had passed the Vistula, and were collected at Praga, his joy was extremely abated, and turning to the Primate, he said, "How much you deceived me when you told me my election was unanimous!"

However, after the news was spread of his being chosen, most people were of opinion that the lowering clouds of war that had hung over Europe during the suspension of the election would soon be dispersed, and

many incidents contributed, besides that of Stanislaus being now actually King (which alone made opposition a more up-hill game), to make the world imagine that this sudden-raised tempest would as suddenly subside. The one was, that the Emperor, finding he was not likely to be supported by any of the Southern powers, himself gave but cold encouragement to the Russians to proceed, though he had been so zealous in pushing them on to the undertaking. In the next place, both the Muscovites and the Emperor were likely to have more material business of their own upon their hands: the first being under apprehensions of the approach of a great body of Tartars, who had made a descent on the side of Muscovy; and the last fearing that a late victory gained by the Turks over the Persians, might induce those ancient enemies of his Imperial Majesty to turn their arms to this part of the globe.

This being the present situation of affairs, every man in England who had the interest of his country at heart and understood it, was glad when the news came that the election was over and made in favour of Stanislaus: in the first place, because everybody of the thin class I have mentioned (that is, who *both* mean and know what is right) is always thoroughly convinced that the most pernicious circumstances his country can be in are those of war, as we must be great losers whilst the war lasts, and can never be great gainers when it ends; in the next place, those who had the least degree of foresight could easily perceive that as matters stood at this time, the success of Stanislaus was the only thing that could possibly prevent a war. For had he, like the Prince

of Conti at the last election,[5] been sent back to France, who could imagine that that Court, after the vast expense made in his favour at Warsaw, and with such an army on the Rhine, would acquiesce under the disappointment and pocket the disgrace, and sit down the quiet dupe of the Court of Vienna, with this rod of vengeance in their hands, and the backs of their antagonists so exposed to correction?

But notwithstanding our interest was thus consequentially so much concerned in this event, few people in England were pleased with it; the honest patriots in opposition to the Court, on one side, being sorry that so unpopular an incident as the breaking out of a war would have been for the Government at this time, was likely to be prevented; and the wise courtiers, on the other part, who knew the inveterate hatred our King bore to the French at this time, being rather desirous to risk their own power, and perhaps his crown, than not make their court to the unreasonable prejudices of their warm ignorant master.

For the Duke of Grafton, he always talked as the King talked; and the Duke of Newcastle, who, to give him his due, seldom slipped an occasion to manifest his good judgment, was foremost in his declarations on this occasion; Lord Hervey (who had acted more prudently to have been glad in private, than to declare his joy) said, for his part he owned he thought the success of Stanislaus the best news he had heard a good while.

[5] In 1697, after the death of Sobieski, the Prince de Conti, after being elected, was ousted by Augustus of Saxony, but Poland was obliged to make *amende* both in money and verbal apologies to France.

The King took him up very short, and said it was no great proof of his justice to rejoice at the good fortune of a man that had been a traitor and a rebel to his lawful sovereign, and had usurped his crown. Lord Hervey assured the King he neither considered the justice of Stanislaus' former nor present pretensions to the crown; that all the reason he had for being glad on this occasion was, having the welfare of England and the ease of his Majesty's Government more at heart than any other consideration.

Sir Robert Walpole, who generally thought and acted with better sense than anybody about him or against him, kept his opinion to himself, wished success to Stanislaus internally, and in a quiet way did all he could to procure it. Besides the national aversion which all Germans are born with to the French, the King had other little motives to wish them disappointed on this occasion; which were, first, the making another Elector a King, and next the aggrandizing the Emperor, whom, as Elector of Hanover, he always looked upon as his chief:—reasons that would have had but small weight in a great mind; but as weak ones are generally actuated by weak principles, so the strongest biasses in narrow souls generally consist of such trifles.

The Queen herself was enough prejudiced too on this side, till Sir Robert Walpole unwarped her from it, and made her see how much this inclination jarred with her own interest. He convinced her that the Emperor had been originally in the wrong in the treaty made between him, Muscovy, and Denmark, for the exclusion of Stanislaus; that it was, moreover, extremely impolitic in his Im-

perial Majesty to run the risk of losing Italy for the sake of nominating a King of Poland; that his suffering his Ambassador to act constantly in conjunction with that of Muscovy at Warsaw and go with him in person to the Primate, bidding him choose Stanislaus at his peril, were steps not to be justified. He further told her that nothing could do the King so much disservice at this time as engaging in war; first, as the name of war was seldom acceptable in this country, but that a war on account of a King of Poland was certainly what the nation could never be brought to think necessary or expedient; and as the elections were now coming on, the ferment in the country so great, and every circumstance that could blacken the Government so industriously improved, it was absolutely necessary for us to keep out of the squabble, and that the only part for us to take was to remain in an absolute state of inaction, without entering into any obligation of neutrality; for to advise giving the Emperor any assistance on this occasion would be (all these circumstances considered) as great an imprudence in the English ministers as it was in the Imperial counsellors to bring their master into a situation that made assistance so necessary. This was the language Sir Robert Walpole talked to the Queen.

In the meantime the Muscovites continuing their march towards Warsaw, and having called in the Cossacks and Kalmucs to their assistance and being joined by the Malcontents of Poland, King Stanislaus, the Primate and their party, who were in no condition to make any resistance, were obliged to leave Warsaw and retire to Dantzic; soon after which the party of

the Elector of Saxony proceeded to an election of their own, and chose him King.

France was so much irritated at this proceeding, that war against the Emperor was now declared in form; Maréchal Berwick passed the Rhine and besieged Fort Kehl; and an army of 40,000 men, under the command of Marshal Villars, passed the Alps (late as it was in the year) in order to attack the Emperor in Italy: this step was taken in consequence of a treaty concluded between the Courts of France and Turin, by which treaty the King of Sardinia obliged himself to give free passage through his territories to the French troops. I cannot help observing here, how very impertinently Lord Essex, the English Ambassador at Turin, was treated on this occasion by that Court: as it was the desire of England at this time to keep the possessions of Italy in the hands they now were, and to preserve the tranquillity of that country, Lord Essex was ordered from his Court to propose an accommodation between the Emperor and the King of Sardinia, the plan of which accommodation the Sardinian ministers desired his Lordship to state to them in writing three weeks after they had actually signed a treaty with the Court of France, by which they obliged themselves to join with France in attacking him.

The King, in telling Lord Hervey this circumstance, one morning at breakfast in the garden at Hampton Court, when nobody was present but the Queen, said that the King of Sardinia's conduct appeared to him to be full as weak with regard to his own interest as it was impertinent with regard to England, and that he would soon find he had exchanged an ally for a master. "His

Sardinian Majesty," replied Lord Hervey,[6] "is so poor a creature, that very few testimonies of his folly could surprise me; but this step would prove all the people about him equal fools to their master, if one imagined they advised this measure as thinking it for the interest of their country: for which reason (continued Lord Hervey) I cannot help believing he must have been secretly sold to France by some Minister in whom he has confided upon this occasion."

"That may easily be," the King answered, "if he is really so poor a creature as you say." Lord Hervey assured his Majesty that it was impossible to describe either the aspect or the understanding of this King as meaner than it had appeared to him, and that the short acquaintance he had had with him five years ago at the Court of Turin, during the life and before the abdication of his father, had given him so low an opinion of his abilities, that he could imagine no error too gross for his Sardinian Majesty to be capable of committing. The Queen asked Lord Hervey if this was said to be merely owing to his natural want of understanding, or if his father had ever been reproached with neglecting his education. Lord Hervey told her Majesty that his father had always, as he had heard, kept him in great subjection, but that no pains had been spared to form him or to make something of him, if there had been any materials to work upon.—Here the King interrupted, and colouring with a mixture of anger and hatred, said,

---

[6] Lord Hervey's recent visit to Italy had made him personally acquainted with those Courts; but his low estimate of the personal character of the King of Sardinia is not borne out either by the historians—nor apparently by the events.

"I do not want to know that there may be people on whom all pains and care in education are thrown away." [7] —Upon which the Queen winked at Lord Hervey to make no reply, and immediately turned the conversation.

At the same time that the French were attacking the Emperor in Italy, they also sent 15,000 men to take possession of the duchy of Lorraine, whilst his Most Christian Majesty, to excuse the abrupt roughness of so uncharitable a deed, was pleased to send this message to his Welsh aunt,[8] the Duchess-Dowager of that country, who was then at Luneville :—

"That reasons of State had forced him very unwillingly to take this step, but that if her Serene Highness, till the present storm in Europe should be blown over, would please to take up her residence in any part of his dominions, she had but to name the place, and he would take care to have it prepared for her with all the respect due to her birth, as a grand-daughter of France, and that she might depend on every mark of affection she could claim from a Prince who was so nearly related to her."

Her Highness received this regal compliment as it deserved, and, with a magnanimity worthy of any Spartan heroine, sent the King of France this answer :—

"That she did not think it at all proper for the mother to take sanctuary in the dominions of the man who had so unequitably seized the son's, and that she should never hope to receive favours where she had not found justice."

After which she retired with her younger son and her two daughters to Brussels.

---

[7] Allusion to Frederick, Prince of Wales. See the close of the last chapter.

[8] She was sister of the Regent Duke of Orleans.

During all these transactions Lord Hervey, who was as much in Sir Robert Walpole's way of thinking as he was in his interest, and vehemently against engaging England in this war, had more frequent opportunities than any other person about the Court of learning the Queen's sentiments on these affairs, and conveying to her his own. Wednesdays and Saturdays, which were the King's days for hunting, he had her to himself for four or five hours, her Majesty always hunting in a chaise, and as she neither saw nor cared to see much of the chase, she had undertaken to mount Lord Hervey the whole summer (who loved hunting as little as she did), so that he might ride constantly by the side of her chaise, and entertain her whilst other people were entertaining themselves with hearing dogs bark and seeing crowds gallop.

Sunday and Monday Lord Hervey lay constantly in London; every other morning he used to walk with the Queen and her daughters at Hampton Court. His real business in London was pleasure; but as he always told the King it was to pick up news, to hear what people said, to see how they looked, and to inform their Majesties what was thought by all parties of the present posture of affairs, he by these means made his pleasure in town and his interest at Court reciprocally conducive to each other.

These excursions put it also in his power to say things as from other people's mouths, which he did not dare to venture from his own, and often to deliver that as the effect of his observation which in reality flowed only from his opinion. However, that he might not draw on others the anger which by this method he

diverted from himself, he used, both to the King and the Queen, to say he would willingly let them know everything he heard, but must beg leave always to be excused from telling where he had it or from whom; and as it was of much more use to their Majesties to know what was said than by whom, so he hoped they would give him leave, whilst for their sakes he communicated the one, for his own to be silent upon the other.

On these terms they accepted of his intelligence, and by these preliminaries he was in possession of saying the most disagreeable truths without either being reproved or being called upon for his authors.

The two great topics on which at present the inquiries of the King and Queen chiefly turned were the elections[9] and the war. As to the first, their Majesties always used to ask if the Opponents seemed in spirits and in hopes; to which Lord Hervey generally replied that as it was so much their business to appear pleased and sanguine, it was very difficult to perceive whether they were really so or not, but as it was very certain no party at any time was ever more indefatigable in their attacks on a Government than the anti-courtiers were at present in every quarter of the kingdom, so if one might guess at their hopes of success by their assiduity in pursuing their objects, no party could ever think themselves more secure of prevailing; "though for my own part (said he), whenever any of them have talked to me in a strain as if they flattered themselves there

[9] He means the *prospect* of the general elections in the following spring.

would be any change in the complexion of the next Parliament, my answer has always been, 'The Court have truth and money on their side—two things which, if rightly managed, must in conjunction ever prevail; and if our friends have not skill enough to point out the force of the one or dexterity enough to insinuate the persuasions of the other, in my opinion they deserve to be beaten; but as almost all mankind are either to be convinced or to be bought, so having sense enough among us to open our mouths and resolution enough to open our purses, what real foundation you gentlemen in the Opposition have to build your hopes upon is past my finding out.'"

"And what," replied the King, "do the puppies answer to this? Do they not look silly? They did not expect, I suppose, to find me so firm. The fools imagined, perhaps, they could frighten me; but they must not think they have got a Stuart upon the throne, or if they do, they will find themselves mistaken."

Lord Hervey said he had no great opinion of their knowledge or their penetration, and, therefore, could not easily determine what was too absurd for such people to believe or hope to propagate. People were of opinion that nothing could keep up the flame kindled in the nation till the next elections without new fuel being added to it, and that no fuel could be so effectual as that of a war. "In the next place, Sir, they say that besides war being generally unpopular, England entering into a war for a King of Poland would make the cause as subject to ridicule as the effect would be to dislike, and consequently give the enemies to your Majesty's Government a double handle for censure

and invective." "What party, then (said the King), do people who wish well to Government hope I will take?" "That of neutrality and inaction, Sir (replied Lord Hervey), from engaging on neither side. They say your Majesty has nothing to apprehend at home or abroad; till you have declared, both sides will court you; and that if your Majesty were to declare, you would lose all advantages you at present have from the friendship of the one, without augmenting the number of those you enjoy from the other. It is further said, if it shall be necessary at last for your Majesty to arbitrate in this quarrel, when the contending parties shall be so weakened by the duration of their contest, their troops declined, and their treasure diminished, they will more easily submit to what your Majesty shall decree, or more readily agree to what you shall propose when so reduced, than in the first warmth of their resentment and in the freshest vigour of their strength at setting out. In the meantime each Power hoping to win you to their friendship, your Majesty's subjects will exercise their commerce freely all over Europe, will enjoy the benefits of peace, whilst their neighbours are harassed by war; and after receiving favours on all hands, whilst others are receiving blows, will, by these means, be able in opulence and prosperity to give laws to those who will have brought themselves into poverty and distress. This is the manner in which your Majesty's friends talk on the present conjuncture; and as one may gather information as well from the discourse of one's enemies as from that of one's friends, and that what the one wishes one should not do, may possibly be as good a rule to judge by, as what the other wishes one

should, so I own the eager desire and the great expectation I see among some people to have your Majesty engaged in this war is as strong a confirmation to me in the opinion that you ought not to be so, as any I hear among our own friends in behalf of peace. I could not help saying, Sir, the other day, to one who, with more zeal than prudence, assured me that the present posture of affairs would certainly be the ruin of my friends, that he would find himself, I believed, extremely mistaken, and, on the contrary, if these occurrences were rightly managed, which I doubted not but they would be, that he would see the situation of affairs abroad would be so far from obstructing your Majesty's measures this winter at home, that it would certainly make them go on easier than if these broils upon the Continent had not happened, as they would silence all the clamour the Opponents hoped to raise next Session against keeping up the present army, and yet not be of a nature sufficient to require the increase of it, by which means the Court would be able to avoid either the unpopularity of entering into a war, or that of keeping up what were last year called useless troops in time of peace. I further told this person, Sir, that I knew the Opponents had laid schemes to have addresses this next Session against the army, as last year against the Excise, from every place in England where they could obtain them, with the most positive instructions from constituents to their representatives to vote against the present number of troops that it was possible to draw up; all which well laid and dexterously laboured scheme must now be overturned and defeated, as no man of common sense could attempt to propose a reduction of the

forces, because no one of common sense would regard him if he did."

Lord Hervey (bent on dissuading the King as far as his power could go from running the English hastily into this Polish squabble) was constantly, whenever he had opportunity of talking to his Majesty, plying him in this strain; nor was he less busy in endeavouring to bring the Queen into a pursuit of these measures, though the way he took to influence her was in some particulars different. He tried to pique her pride into espousing what he thought right, by telling her that everybody in town was of opinion that her Majesty saw plainly it was the interest of the nation and the interest of the Court for the King, as long as it was possible, to keep us out of this war, for which reason she was constantly labouring to bring his Majesty to forbear urging matters to extremity; but that in this point people said she would be overruled, and her prudence forced to give way to his impetuosity, and her will, though hitherto absolute in the State, now made to yield to his. By inculcating these things Lord Hervey endeavoured to make her engage in pursuing what was not her inclination, lest people should think it was, and that she wanted power to fulfil it.

But whilst I relate these things said by Lord Hervey on this occasion, I am far from meaning to insinuate that they were conveyed to their Majesties only from him, or that he was the secret spring on which many great events moved. That was not the case; for Sir Robert Walpole constantly, and with much more weight, talked in the same strain. My reason, therefore, for putting these arguments into Lord Hervey's mouth in

this narrative is, because I *know* they were said by him, and only *conjecture* their being said by any other person. And as he was the only man of common sense, not upon the foot of a minister, who had access to them at their private and leisure hours, he had more opportunities of saying things than many of those who held the same sentiments, and had more understanding than many of those who had the same opportunities.

Spain had not yet adventured herself either in league against the Emperor in Italy or in a resolution to defend him, nor was she determined to maintain a neutrality; and as much depended on the part she would act, strenuous endeavours were used on both sides to gain her. The King having undertaken to negotiate this affair between the Courts of Vienna and Spain, the whole transaction was carried on at the Court of England, where the Conde de Montijo, Ambassador from Spain to this Court, was set up at auction, whilst M. de Chavigny, the French minister, and Count Kinski, the Imperial Ambassador, bid for him.

What I am going to relate I had directly from the mouth of the Queen, who being always partial to the Emperor, one may be sure his faults in this relation are not exaggerated.

The plan of accommodation and alliance between the Imperial and Spanish Courts was drawn up by Sir Robert Walpole, and these were the terms:—that on condition the Emperor would give the second Arch-Duchess with the kingdom of Naples and Sicily as dower, that Spain should support the Emperor in the possession of every other country he was master of in Italy, and even of these during his life.

This proposal was given in writing to Montijo and Kinski, and despatched by them to their respective Courts. Montijo received full powers to sign, whilst Kinski received nothing in answer but inexplicable instructions, that bore no marks of anything plainly to be understood but the pride and folly of the present head of the Austrian family, who seemed to regulate his whole conduct on the haughty maxims of Charles V., without either his understanding or his purse.

However, as things grew every hour worse and worse for the Emperor; as the arms of France both in Italy and on the Rhine made such quick work in defeating him; and as so much time would be necessary, if fresh instances were sent to Vienna, for the Emperor's assent to this accommodation, and the return of that messenger waited for; and as the Spanish Ambassador had powers to sign and offered to make use of them; the King of England pressed Kinski extremely to strike whilst the iron was hot, showed him the danger of delay, and offered to write with his own hand to the Emperor to indemnify him; but neither the King, the Queen, nor any of our ministers could prevail with him to conclude this matter without sending for further powers and instructions. But before this messenger returned, Spain, irritated by these delays of the Emperor, had joined with France, and when Kinski, on the arrival of this last courier, offered to sign the treaty, the Spanish minister refused, said it was now too late, that his master had concluded a treaty with the King of France, and had already given orders for his troops immediately to join those of France and Sardinia in Italy.

By this absurd conduct of the Emperor, therefore, he first lost the advantages he might have had rather than lower his pride, and then had the mortification of quitting his pride without the benefit of getting anything by so doing.

The consequence of which reasonable and judicious behaviour was, that before the Parliament met this year, which was in the middle of January, the war in Italy was prosecuted with so much vigour by this triple alliance of France, Spain, and Sardinia, that the Emperor was not master of one single place in Italy on this side the Ecclesiastical State but the Mantuan. His affairs having been so well managed, that with 13,000 men in Lombardy, and provisions for double that number and ammunition in proportion, these essentials of war were so disposed and scattered, that wherever there were provisions there was no ammunition, and where there was ammunition there were no provisions, and where there were men there was neither ammunition nor provisions.

CHAPTER XIII.

Marriage of Princess Royal—Arrival of Prince of Orange—King's treatment of him—Lord Hervey reports ill of his person, but well of his mind—Behaviour of the Princess—Prince falls dangerously ill—Prince of Wales's dissension with the King—His revenue—Lord Hervey's advice—The Queen's answer—King's Speech—Lord Hervey moves the Address—New Peerages—Lord Chancellor Talbot—Lord Chief-Justice Hardwicke—Lord Chancellor King—Dukes of Marlborough and Bedford—Bill to make Army Commissions for life—King's ungiving disposition—Duke of Richmond—"Court Drudge"—Further particulars of the Queen's character and conduct.

THE summer now drawing to a conclusion, the marriage of the Princess Royal began again to be talked of, and those necessary previous stipulations were anew taken into consideration which the dilatoriness of the King, the indifference of his Ministers, and the tardy phlegm of Dutch negotiators had left unadjusted for more months than they really required days to be settled in if proper diligence had been used. At last everything was finished, and a yacht ordered to Holland to bring the Prince of Orange over. Horace Walpole, under the pretence of going to attend his Highness hither, was sent to concert measures with the ministers of the States, and agree what part England and Holland should take at this very critical conjuncture of affairs.

But this finesse was as coarse as it was ridiculous and unnecessary, everybody the moment he was nominated for this voyage discerning the reason of it, and everybody knowing that—whether Horace was sent to Hol-

land or not—it was natural, reasonable, necessary, and sure that Holland and England ought, must, and would act in concert upon this occasion.

The beginning of November [*the 7th*] the Prince of Orange arrived, and was lodged in Somerset House: almost all the nobility and people of distinction in England went to wait upon him there; several were of that number who did not come to Court. He came the next morning to St. James's through crowded streets and unceasing acclamations, though the equipage the King sent to fetch him was only one miserable leading coach with only a pair of horses.[1]

The palace was so thronged that he could hardly get up stairs or pass from one room to another, most people having a curiosity to see him, and few having yet found out that making their court to him was not making it at all to his future father-in-law.

The maxim the King seemed to have laid down to govern his conduct towards this Prince, and the opinion he seemed to desire tacitly to inculcate was, that the Prince of Orange was a nothing till he had married his daughter, and that being her husband made him everything.

Conformable to this maxim he suffered no sort of public honours to be paid to the Prince on his arrival, and behaved himself with scarce common civility

---

[1] Strange to say, the peculiar meaning of "*a leading coach*" has been lost in the Master of the Horse's office, though these offices are usually so conservative of etiquette. It seems, however, that Lord Hervey's complaint was unfounded; for the last record found of a "*leading coach*" is the sending one in 1797 for the Prince of Wirtemberg, then come over to marry the Princess Royal—so that the *leading coach* seems to have been the proper equipage.

towards him, which the Prince of Orange had sense enough to feel and to seem not to see. The Tower guns were not allowed to salute him, nor was the guard permitted to turn out upon his arrival.[2] Lord Lovelace was sent with one of the King's coaches to receive him at his landing, and with great difficulty the King was persuaded, the night the Prince came first to Somerset House, to send Lord Hervey to him with his compliments.

The Queen desired Lord Hervey the instant he returned to come directly to her apartment, and let her know without disguise what sort of hideous animal she was to prepare herself to see. Lord Hervey, when he came back, assured her he had not found him near so bad as he had imagined; that she must not expect to see an Adonis, that his body was as bad as possible, but that his countenance was far from disagreeable, and his address sensible, engaging, and noble; that he seemed entirely to forget his person, and to have an understanding to make other people forget it too.[3]

---

[2] Lord Hervey is here again, I think, rather hypercritical. The Prince did not receive these or similar honours at home, and was not yet the King's son-in-law; and so was not entitled to be received with royal state:—which, moreover, would have needlessly increased the jealousy, already felt in Holland, of this alliance. See *post*, p. 319.

[3] The Prince was about twenty-two. Lord Hervey gives subsequently a worse account of his person; but Lord Chesterfield's portrait in 1729, when the match was first thought of, is more favourable:—

"*The Hague*, 18*th Feb.*—The Prince of Orange arrived here last night. I went to wait upon him, and, as far as I am able to judge from half an hour's conversation only, I think he has extreme good parts. He is perfectly well bred, and civil to everybody, and with an ease and freedom that is seldom acquired but by a long knowledge of the world. His face is handsome; his shape is not so advantageous as could be wished, though not near so bad as I had heard represented. He assumes not the least dignity, but has all the affability and insinuation that is necessary for a person who would raise himself in a popular government."—*Chest. Cor.* iii. 48.

Lord Hervey said he fancied the Princess must be in a good deal of anxiety; but the Queen told him he was extremely mistaken, that she was in her own apartment at her harpsichord with some of the Opera people,[4] and that she had been as easy all that afternoon as she had ever seen her in her life. "For my part," said the Queen, "I never said the least word to encourage her to this marriage or to dissuade her from it; the King left her, too, absolutely at liberty to accept or reject it; but as she thought the King looked upon it as a proper match, and one which, if she could bear his person, he should not dislike, she said she was resolved, if it was a monkey, she would marry him."

From the Queen Lord Hervey went to the Princesses, who were very impatient for a description of their new brother-in-law, and asked if they were more likely to have a true one for his being in the same town than they were from one who had only seen him in Holland.

The Princess Royal's behaviour next day, and indeed every day, with the eyes of the whole nation upon her, was something marvellous for propriety, sense, and good breeding. The Monday following was the day fixed for the ceremony; but the Prince being taken ill of a fever the day before, it was put off. He continued ill a long time; was thought at first in immediate danger, and for a considerable time in a languishing condition from which it was impossible he should ever recover.

During this tedious and dangerous illness no one of

[4] The Princess Royal was a good musician, and a warm and constant patroness of Handel, who had been her music-master.

the Royal Family went to see him. The King thought it below his dignity, and the rest, whatever they thought, were not allowed to do it.

The Prince of Orange could not but be extremely concerned at this treatment; but had, however, the prudence to be silent on a chapter which his Dutch booby retinue had the imprudence to preach upon all day and in all companies.

As soon as he was able to go out he went to St. James's, and by chance dined with the Princesses, who were forbid to invite him any more. He removed to Kensington for the air, and was from thence sent to the Bath. But—on his arrival in England—on the day for the marriage being appointed—on its being put off—on his illness—on his recovery—on his being in danger—or on his being out of it—the countenance of the Princess Royal to the nicest examiners appeared exactly the same; which surprised everybody so much the more as she was known to be of a temper to which nothing was really indifferent, whatever it appeared.

1734.—On new-year's day the Prince of Wales was persuaded by Mr. Dodington to go to the King's levee, where he had not made his appearance for some months, and was now induced to it not from a desire to show respect to his father, but in order (hoping the King would not speak to him) to show the world how ill he was used and what little encouragement he had to pay his father any compliment of that kind. Lord Hervey, who knew from Mr. Hedges (the Prince's treasurer) the night before that the Prince intended going to the King's levee, told the Queen of it, and

desired her to contrive the King's speaking to him, to prevent what they proposed, telling her how useful it would be towards stopping the report of the Prince's ill usage, and what a damp it would cast upon the schemes of those who built their hopes of annoyance this winter upon the expectation of an open rupture in the family.

This intimation had its effect; the Prince was spoken to in the presence of that numerous appearance of bowing nobility and gentry who generally thronged the palace on those days, and the report of no intercourse either of words or visits passing between these two great personages was, of course, refuted.

Lord Hervey took the opportunity of this interview with the Queen and the Prince's name being mentioned, to tell her that even the best friends to her, the King, and the Administration were of opinion that the Prince had not money enough allowed him, and that whilst he was so straitened in his circumstances it was impossible he should ever be quiet. "Ah!" said the Queen, "that people will always be judging and deciding upon what they know nothing of; who are these wise people?" Lord Hervey desired to be excused,—and she went on. "Pray, when you hear them, my Lord, talk their nonsense again, tell them that the Prince costs the King 50,000*l.* a-year, which, till he is married, I believe any reasonable body will think a sufficient allowance for him. But, poor creature, with not a bad heart, he is induced by knaves and fools that blow him up to do things that are as unlike an honest man as a wise one. I wonder what length those monsters wish to carry him: but talk to me no more of his

usage; I wish he was as right towards the King as the King is towards him." Lord Hervey said he did not at all dispute the fact of the Prince's costing the King 50,000*l.* a-year; but if her Majesty would give him leave, he would only ask why, instead of the King's being at half that expense invisibly, he would not choose rather to let the Prince keep his own table and give him that allowance in a lump, which everybody would acknowledge to be sufficient, and which, given in this manner, would be at once more useful and satisfactory to the Prince, and more creditable as well as less troublesome to the King. When she was pressed upon this point she had nothing to answer, but that the King did not choose it should be so.

This being the Prince's present situation, his numerous creditors being importunate, and his treasury empty, the clandestine correspondence between him and the Opposition continued in full force, he hoping to make some use of their despair, and they of his distress. The great points that were expected to be pushed this Session in Parliament by the Opposition were this affair of the Prince's, a scrutiny into the debt of the Navy, which was 1,800,000*l.*, and the repeal of the Septennial Bill.

Upon foreign affairs the *Craftsman* and his whole party were quite silent, not caring, till the Court had declared what part it would act, to say what they thought right, because they would be at liberty, whatever that part should be, to pronounce it wrong.

It was the business of Sir Robert Walpole, therefore, to keep his designs in the dark as long as he could, but everybody concluded that at the opening of the

Session in the King's Speech he would be obliged to declare one way or other. How dexterously and judiciously he avoided that declaration can never be told so well by anything as the Speech itself.[5]

Lord Hervey was pitched upon in the House of Lords, much against the Duke of Newcastle's will, to move the address to the King's Speech; and as what he said may serve to illustrate the language talked at this time by all the advocates for the Administration, I shall give it at length [in the Appendix].

He concluded with the motion for the address, which I need not repeat; addresses of this kind, at the beginning of a session, being never anything more than echoing back the words of the throne, with general assurances of zeal and fidelity, confidence in his Majesty's wisdom and goodness, and a sort of promissory note for compliance with his demands. The address of the Commons was to the same effect; and both passed without opposition.

Before I proceed to the relation of what passed this session in Parliament I must give a short account of the changes made in the House of Lords in favour of the Court since the ruffle on the South Sea affair last year.

In the first place, all those who had not been turned out of their employments for that elopement were returned to the yoke from which they had started, and drew as quietly as if they had never been restive.

In the next place, four new lords were added to this

[5] Delivered 17th January, 1734. Lord Hervey had here inserted the printed speech; but as it may be found in the Journals and Magazines, it seems not worth while to reprint it.

body—Lord Hinton, Lord Talbot, Lord Hardwicke, and Lord Hervey. Lord Hinton was eldest son to Earl Poulet, a man of a great estate, who had been Lord Steward in the four last years of Queen Anne's reign, and was this year gained over to the Court on his son's being made Lord of the Bedchamber, and called up to the House of Peers. Lord Hardwicke and Lord Talbot were two as great and eminent lawyers as this country ever bred; the first had been Attorney-General, and the last Solicitor. Upon the corporal death of my Lord Chief Justice Raymond, and the intellectual demise of Lord Chancellor King, these two men, Sir Philip Yorke and Mr. Talbot, were destined to succeed them; but the voracious appetite of the law in these days was so keen, that these two morsels without any addition were not enough to satisfy these two cormorant stomachs. Here lay the difficulty: Sir Philip Yorke, being first in rank, had certainly a right to the Chancellor's seals; but Mr. Talbot, who was an excellent Chancery lawyer and knew nothing of the Common law, if he was not Chancellor, would be nothing. Yorke therefore, though fit for both these employments, got the worst, being prevailed upon to accept that of Lord Chief Justice, on the salary being raised from 3000*l.* to 4000*l.* a-year for life, and 1000*l.* more paid him out of the Chancellor's salary by Lord Talbot. This was a scheme of Sir Robert Walpole's, who, as Homer says of Ulysses, was always fertile in expedients, and thought these two great and able men of too much consequence to lose or disoblige either. Sir Robert communicated this scheme secretly to the Queen, she insinuated it to the King, and the King

proposed it to Sir Robert as an act of his own ingenuity and generosity.

Lord Talbot had as clear, separating, distinguishing, subtle, and fine parts as ever man had. Lord Hardwicke's were perhaps less delicate, but no man's were more forcible. No one could make more of a good cause than Lord Hardwicke, and no one so much of a bad one as Lord Talbot. The one had infinite knowledge, the other infinite ingenuity: they were both excellent, but very different; both amiable in their private characters, as well as eminent in their public capacities; both good pleaders, as well as upright judges; and both esteemed by all parties, as much for their temper and integrity as for their knowledge and abilities.

There was something very singular in the fortune of the deposed Chancellor, Lord King, as he was perhaps the only instance that can be given of a man raised from the most mean and obscure condition to the highest dignity in the state without the malice of one enemy ever pretending to insinuate that the partiality of his friends, in any one step of this rise, had pushed him beyond his merit. He was made Chancellor as much by the voice of the public as by the hand of power; but his entrance on that employment proved the vertical point of his glory, for from the moment he possessed it his reputation, without the least reflection upon his integrity, began to sink; and had the seals been taken from him, even before his imbecility occasioned by his apoplectic fits, it would have been with the same universal approbation with which they were conferred. Expedition was never reckoned among the merits of the Court of Chancery; but whilst Lord King pre-

sided there the delays of it were insupportable. He had such a diffidence of himself that he did not dare to do right, for fear of doing wrong; decrees were always extorted from him; and had he been let alone he would never have given any suitor his due, for fear of giving him what was not so. This actual injustice was all he avoided to commit; never reflecting that the suspension of justice, in keeping people long out of their rights, was a negative injury, which, considering the trouble, the expense, the anxiety, and the thousand other inconveniences that attended those delays, was almost as bad as the total privation of it.

His understanding was of that balancing, irresolute kind that gives people just light enough to see difficulties and form doubts, and not enough to surmount the one or remove the other; which sort of understanding was of use to him as a pleader, though a trouble to him as a judge, and made him make a great figure at the bar, but an indifferent one upon the Chancery bench; the same knowledge and talents that helped him to puzzle other judges when they were to decide, contributed to puzzle himself when it was his turn to do so. The Queen once said of him, and very truly, as well as agreeably, that "He was just in the law what he had formerly been in the Gospel—making creeds[6] upon the one without any steady belief, and judgments in the other without any settled opinion: but the misfortune," said she, "for the public is, that, though they could reject his silly creeds, they are forced often to submit to his silly judgments."

[6] Lord King had dabbled in divinity, and published in 1702 a History of the Apostles' Creed.

Soon after he was Chancellor complaints were made that all the equity of the nation was at a full stand; but till he had in a great measure lost his senses[7] by repeated attacks of apoplexy and palsy the Court did not displace him; and even then, though he had a pension of 3000*l.* a-year given him on his dismission, he was as much out of humour as if they had given him nothing, and as angry at being out of his employment as if he had been still fit to exercise the duties of it. The next summer he died, little regretted by anybody, but least of all by His Majesty, who saved 3000*l.* a-year by it.

Notwithstanding all the menaces thrown out by the Opposition previous to the opening of this session, and the vigorous attacks expected consequently to be made upon the ministry, no session ever passed off more quietly; nor did the business of the Court any year ever meet with fewer rubs.

This was owing principally to the Opponents laying their chief stress on a point full as unpopular as any proposal that ever came from the Administration, which was bringing in a bill to make the commissions of the officers of the army commissions for life; to take away the power of breaking any officer of the army from the Crown, and to lodge that power solely in a court martial. For the arguments against this proposal I refer my readers to a pamphlet written by Lord Hervey, at the desire of the King and Queen, corrected by Sir Robert Walpole, and entitled 'The Conduct of the Opposition and the Tendency of Modern Patriotism,

[7] See ante, p. 157.

&c.'; which pamphlet I shall put into the Appendix to these Memoirs.[8] The bill to make the officers' commissions for life was moved in both Houses the same day, and rejected in both by a great majority.

Immediately after the bill was rejected a motion was made in both Houses to address the King, to know who advised him to take away the regiments of the Duke of Bolton and Lord Cobham, which motion had the same fate as its predecessor the bill. In the debate upon this second question, the Duke of Argyle, with the Duke of Bolton staring in his face all the while he was speaking, took occasion to say, he could not imagine what lords meant by coupling these two men together when they talked of the hardship of their being broke; "They are both men (said he) of great quality, it is true; and it is very certain that two colonels were broke, but of these two colonels I know of but one soldier." There had been an old grudge between the Duke of Argyle and the Duke of Bolton, which provoked the first to say this; but the Duke of Argyle was not commended for it, it being thought no great honour for him to try his wit or his courage with the Duke of Bolton, who was so little suspected of either.[9] Besides, as there were many men of rank, honour, courage, and character at present in the army, who had never served abroad (a necessary consequence of twenty years' peace), the Duke of Argyle did not make his court much to them by this definition of a soldier, which was (when he was called upon by the Duke of Bolton to explain himself), that he could reckon nobody a soldier that had never

[8] For the reasons already given, p. 144, this pamphlet is not reprinted.

[9] See ante, p. 211, n.

served but in peace. In short, the Duke of Argyle got no honour by offering this injury; and the Duke of Bolton only lost none in his tame, cool manner of resenting it, because he had none to lose.

The bill to make the commissions of the officers for life was brought into the House of Lords by the Duke of Marlborough, to whom the King, whilst he was Lord Sunderland, had always shown a family dislike on his father's account; but this step so strengthened his Majesty's enmity, that "scoundrel, rascal, or blackguard," whenever he spoke of him in private after that occurrence, never failed of being tacked to his name.[10] The Duke of Bedford,[11] who had married Lady Dye Spencer, the Duke of Marlborough's sister, rose little better in the King's good graces than his brother-in-law, being equally violent at this time in his opposition to the Court, and, like the Duke of Marlborough, under the absolute direction and government of Lord Carteret.

These two young dukes were of great consideration from their quality and their estates, and were as much alike in pride, violence of temper, and their public conduct, as they were different in their ways of thinking and acting in private life: the Duke of Marlborough was profuse, and never looked into his affairs; the Duke of Bedford covetous, and the best economist in the world: the Duke of Bedford was of such a turn as to have been able to live within his fortune if it had

[10] May not some of this enmity be attributed to the intended marriage of Lady Diana with the Prince of Wales (ante, p. 236, n.)—a secret with which Lord Hervey was perhaps not acquainted?

[11] John, fourth Duke, born in 1710, married in 1731, who for the rest of this reign and the beginning of the next played a considerable part in the political world.

been fifty times less; and the Duke of Marlborough to have run his out had it been fifty times greater. This made Lord Hervey often pay his court to the King (who hated them both) by saying his Majesty would in a very few years see these two men as inconsiderable as any two in the kingdom—the one from giving nothing, and the other from having nothing to give. These two brothers were as unlike in their understandings as in the particulars I have already mentioned: the understanding of the Duke of Marlborough was quite uncultivated, and that of the Duke of Bedford extremely cultivated without being the better for it: the one was incapable of application, the other had a great deal. The Duke of Marlborough wanted materials, the Duke of Bedford to know how to use them; and as the one in company, conscious of his ignorance, was generally diffident and silent, the other was always assured, talkative, and decisive: so that the Duke of Marlborough was sensible he wanted knowledge, whilst the Duke of Bedford had knowledge and was not sensible he wanted parts.

The proposal I have mentioned, of making the officers' commissions for life, being not agreeable to the people, and a thing that seemed rather calculated personally to insult the King than to distress or attack his ministers, posterity will naturally be surprised that so many great and able men as were now embarked in the Opposition could make so injudicious a step and pitch upon so improper a point to labour. It proceeded in part from a desire to make a compliment to Lord Cobham, and to revive the clamour raised on the dismission of so old and creditable an officer; but the

chief reason of it was this—the Opposition did not yet despair of gaining Lord Scarborough over to their party; and Lord Chesterfield having told them all that in the late reign, when this thing was very near being brought into Parliament, Lord Scarborough had declared vehemently for it, they all concluded that Lord Scarborough would be catched in this business, as he had been in the South Sea affair the preceding year, and think himself bound to promote that in public which he had professed approving in private.

But this scheme, well as it was laid, did not take effect; for Lord Scarborough not only voted but spoke very warmly against the bill. He owned in his speech that he had formerly been of a different opinion in this matter when cursorily examined, but that upon mature deliberation he had changed his mind; and though he once only considered this scheme in the light of a point gained upon the Crown that would incapacitate any prince from abusing this power of displacing officers, yet, when he came to reflect on the inconveniences that would attend the lodging that power in the hands proposed, he found those inconveniences much greater, and attended with more danger to the liberties of the people, than leaving it where it was, as it would create an independency in the army that might in time make it capable of overturning the whole civil government.

However, Lord Scarborough was not satisfied with this public declaration; he was afraid, notwithstanding, that people might impute his speaking and acting in this manner to interest, rather than conviction, and resolved to prove that interest was not his motive. In order to do so, the morning before the debate came on

he wrote a letter to the King to tell him the situation he was in, and, as the only way he had left to show the world, who might be busy with his character on this occasion, that his behaviour was the result of his opinion, and not of any mean complaisance to keep his employments, he begged to resign them; assuring the King at the same time that he did not take this step from any mixture of disgust or want of zeal for his service; that he was as firmly attached as ever in affection to his Majesty's person, and as zealous to promote and as ready to declare he approved all his measures as formerly; that he had not the least complaint against any of his ministers; and that he would convince the world, by doubling if possible his assiduity in his Majesty's service in Parliament, that he had no other reason for taking this resolution of quitting his employments but to avoid the trap which he saw laid for him, and out of which he had no other way of extricating himself with honour and reputation.

The day after he wrote this letter the King desired to see him, made him great professions of kindness and esteem, and insisted on his taking a few days more to consider of this business before he came to any final determination. The Queen saw him too, and talked to him in the same strain: she said afterwards that she never saw any man in such agitation and perplexity in her life; and that Lord Scarborough had told her he had not possessed himself, or been able to sleep, since he knew of this business being certainly to come into the House, from the anxiety he was in, and the not knowing how to act in such a manner as should do justice both to his opinion and to his character. Sir Robert

Walpole, the Duke of Newcastle, Mr. Pelham, and Lord Lonsdale, all pressed him extremely to change his resolution, saying it would certainly be thought by all mankind that discontent had induced him to take it; consequently, his persisting in it must hurt those to whom he wished well, and give credit and strength to the party who endeavoured to distress the Court and destroy the Administration.

These representations so far prevailed, that he was persuaded to keep his regiment and remain of the Cabinet Council,[12] but his Mastership of the Horse he resigned in form the following week.

The parting between his master and him on this occasion was so tender, that they embraced like equals and wept like lovers. The Opposition triumphed a good deal on the first news of Lord Scarborough's having quitted, but their triumph was short, for he soon after took occasion in the House to declare himself more warmly in the interest of the Court than he had ever done before, and continued so to do, upon every point in debate, during the whole session.

This made every man who opposed the Court condemn his conduct, and say he had tied himself down a greater slave to the Administration by this strange, injudicious manner of quitting an employment than any the most mercenary tool had ever done by accepting one. Some said it was a sort of Don Quixotism in politics; others, who had a mind to be more abusive, called him the Sir Paul Methuen of the House of Lords; and Sir

[12] The great officers of the Household were at this time usually members of what was called the Cabinet Council. See at the end of the Memoirs Lord Hervey's account of the Cabinet.

Robert Walpole himself, in speaking of Lord Scarborough's behaviour at this time to Lord Hervey, laughed, shrugged his shoulders, shook his head, and pointed to his forehead.[13]

The Duke of Richmond asked the King immediately to succeed Lord Scarborough, and the King was not averse to granting his request any further than he was always averse to giving anything to anybody. Many ingredients concurred to form this reluctance in his Majesty to bestowing. One was that, taking all his notions from a German measure, he thought every man who served him in England overpaid; another was, that while employments were vacant he saved the salary; but the most prevalent of all was his never having the least inclination to oblige. I do not believe there ever lived a man to whose temper benevolence was so absolutely a stranger. It was a sensation that, I dare say, never accompanied any one act of his power; so that whatever good he did was either extorted from him, or was the adventitious effect of some self-interested act of policy: consequently, if any seeming favour he conferred ever obliged the receiver, it must have been because the man on whom it fell was ignorant of the motives from which the giver bestowed. I remember Sir Robert Walpole saying once, in speaking to me of the King, that to talk with him of compassion, consideration of past services, charity, and bounty, was making use of words that with him had no meaning. This habit of keeping employments vacant drew him often

[13] Lord Scarborough's death soon after, by his own hand, as well as the inconsistency of his semi-resignation, and some other circumstances, seem to justify Sir Robert's suspicion. See *Suffolk Cor.*, ii. 87.

into great difficulties, and was necessarily attended with many inconveniences; for, as delay on such occasions always begets competitors, so of course it not only increases the number of the refused, and consequently of the disobliged, whenever the disposal is made, but also lessens, if not cancels, the obligation even towards them whose solicitation at last prevails; people very naturally and very reasonably thinking themselves not bound to do much towards repaying any benefit when they have been made to do a great deal towards earning it: they consider all that previous trouble as so much advanced in part of payment, and never fail to make allowances for it when they come to balance the account in what they think they remain in debt to their benefactor.

The King's neither giving the Duke of Richmond this employment immediately, nor directly promising it, embarrassed his Majesty afterwards extremely, when Lord Pembroke[14] asked it, as it laid him under the necessity of giving the preference to one of them in his choice, when he need have given the preference only to the first comer, which the last cannot or ought not ever to take ill.

Lord Pembroke's pretensions to this office were certainly very reasonable, as he was a man of great quality, of an extreme good character, beloved by everybody who knew him, and had served the King twenty years in the bedchamber, without any other preferment than a regiment, in exchange for which he had

[14] Henry, ninth Earl. Lord Chesterfield, who was very anxious for Lord Pembroke's success, says (*Suff. Corr.*, vol. ii., p. 81) that the question had been decided in the Duke's favour as early as July, though not announced till Lord Pembroke was satisfied.

quitted a troop of Guards, for which he had paid 10,000*l.*

The Duke of Richmond's plea was not weaker as to character, and was stronger as to quality, especially at this Court, where the difference of coronets was often much more considered than the difference of the heads that wore them. He made great expenses, too, in elections, and was thoroughly zealous both for the Government and the Administration. There never lived a man of a more amiable composition; he was friendly, benevolent, generous, honourable, and thoroughly noble in his way of acting, talking, and thinking; he had constant spirits, was very entertaining, and had a great deal of knowledge, though, not having had a school-education, he was a long while reckoned ignorant by the generality of the world, who are as apt to call every man a blockhead that does not understand Greek and Latin, as they are to think many of those no blockheads who understand nothing else. His being grandson to King Charles II., I must confess, prejudiced people much more reasonably against his understanding,[15] and contributed extremely to its being underrated till he came to be thoroughly known; for, as fish with wings, instead of fins, would hardly be a greater prodigy than a Stuart with sense, so people had the utmost difficulty without their own auricular conviction to conceive there could be one *Lot* of sense out of that Sodom of fools.

[15] This is surely a strange remark when coupled with the name of Charles II., who was certainly no "fool;" it was prompted, I think, by Lord Hervey's dislike of his colleague the Duke of Grafton. "There was," says Horace Walpole, "a mortal antipathy between the Duke of Grafton and Lord Hervey, and the Court was often on the point of being disturbed by their enmities."—*Reminis.*

I cannot help mentioning, before I quit this head of the King's ungiving disposition, two instances, which I think such strong proofs of it, that, to people who know not the millions of corroborating testimonies one might bring, they would be alone sufficient to demonstrate it.

The instances I mean are my Lord Lifford, and his sister, Lady Charlotte de Roussie.[16] These two people, born in France, having more religion than sense,[17] left their native country on account of being Protestants; and being of great quality, and not in great circumstances, had, during four reigns, subsisted upon the scanty charity of the English Court: they were constantly — every night in the country, and three nights in the week in town—alone with the King and Queen for an hour or two before they went to bed, during which time the King walked about and talked to the brother of armies, or to the sister of genealogies, whilst the Queen knotted and yawned, till from yawning she came to nodding, and from nodding to snoring.

These two poor miserable Court drudges were in more constant waiting than any of the pages of the back stairs, were very simple and very quiet, did nobody any hurt, nor anybody but his Majesty any pleasure, who paid them so ill for all their assiduity and slavery, that they were not only not in affluence, but

[16] They were the children of Frederic Charles de Roye de la Rochefoucaud, Count de Roye et de *Roucy*, a French Protestant, who came into England in 1688, and was created Earl of Lifford in Ireland. Lady Charlotte de Roye, "commonly called *de Roucy*," was Gouvernante to the younger children of George II.

[17] It must not be forgotten that Lord Hervey was so unfortunate as to be what was called a Freethinker, and never fails to sneer at religion.

laboured under the disagreeable burdens of small debts (which a thousand pounds would have paid), and had not an allowance from the Court that enabled them to appear there even in the common decency of clean clothes. The King, nevertheless, was always saying how well he loved them, and calling them the best people in the world. But, though he never forgot their goodness, he never remembered their poverty; and by giving them so much of his time, which nobody but him would have given them, and so little of his money, which everybody but him in his situation would have afforded them, he gave one just as good an opinion of his understanding by what he bestowed, as he did of his generosity by what he withheld. The Queen, whose most glaring merit was not that of giving, was certainly with regard to this poor woman as blameable as the King. For the playthings of princes, let them be ever so trifling, ought always to be gilt, those who contribute to their pleasure having a right to their bounty. To most people, however, it was a matter of wonder how the King and Queen could have such persons constantly with them. The truth of the case was, that the King had no taste for better company, and the Queen, though she had a better taste, was forced to mortify her own to please his. Her predominant passion was pride, and the darling pleasure of her soul was power; but she was forced to gratify the one and gain the other, as some people do health, by a strict and painful *régime*, which few besides herself could have had patience to support, or resolution to adhere to. She was at least seven or eight hours *tête-à-tête* with the King every day,

during which time she was generally saying what she did not think, assenting to what she did not believe, and praising what she did not approve; for they were seldom of the same opinion, and he too fond of his own for her ever at first to dare to controvert it ("*consilii quamvis egregii quod ipse non afferret, inimicus:*"—"An enemy to any counsel, however excellent, which he himself had not suggested."—*Tacitus*);[18] she used to give him her opinion as jugglers do a card, by changing it imperceptibly, and making him believe he held the same with that he first pitched upon. But that which made these *tête-à-têtes* seem heaviest was that he neither liked reading nor being read to (unless it was to sleep): she was forced, like a spider, to spin out of her own bowels all the conversation with which the fly was taken. However, to all this she submitted for the sake of power, and for the reputation of having it; for the vanity of being thought to possess what she desired was equal to the pleasure of the possession itself. But, either for the appearance or the reality, she knew it was absolutely necessary to have interest in her husband, as she was sensible that interest was the measure by which people would always judge of her power. Her every thought, word, and act therefore tended and was calculated to preserve her influence there; to him she sacrificed her time, for him she mortified her inclination; she looked, spake, and breathed but for him, like a weathercock to every capricious blast of his uncertain temper, and governed him (if

[18] Lord Hervey in his quotations sometimes makes variances from the received texts, which, being either slight or made to suit the subject, I leave unaltered. He generally accompanies them with a translation: where he sometimes omits, I have supplied it.

such influence so gained can bear the name of government) by being as great a slave to him thus ruled, as any other wife could be to a man who ruled her. For all the tedious hours she spent then in watching him whilst he slept, or the heavier task of entertaining him whilst he was awake, her single consolation was in reflecting she had power, and that people in coffee-houses and *ruelles*[19] were saying she governed this country, without knowing how dear the government of it cost her.[20]

---

[19] "*Ruelles:* espace qu'on laisse entre le lit et la muraille. On appelait autrefois *ruelles* les alcoves, et en général les lieux parés, où les dames, soit au lit, soit debout, recevaient leurs visites."—*Dict. Français.* Hence the word came to be used generally for any circle of chit-chat or gossiping.

[20] It seems at first sight unfair to exclude, so completely as Lord Hervey does, the possibility that duty and affection towards so fond a husband—the father of her many children—might have had some share in the Queen's submissive and patient conduct; but we shall see, by and by, that she condescended to compliances with the King's temper and passions that cannot be thus palliated.

CHAPTER XIV.

Proceedings in Parliament—The Prince of Wales's Affairs and his Character—Increase of the Army—Vote of Confidence—Lord Hervey disapproves of both—High state of Literature—Marriage of the Princess Royal—Figure of the Bridegroom—Pretensions of the Irish Peers—Horace Walpole—End of the Session—Speaker Onslow Treasurer of the Navy—Lord Stair dismissed—Prince and Princess of Orange depart—Miss Vane—Elections—Dissatisfaction of the King and Queen—Lord Isla and the Duke of Argyle.

BUT to return from this digression to the proceedings of the Parliament this winter, I must relate how the three points most apprehended went off. The debt of the navy the Opponents could make nothing of. 1,200,000*l.* was given out of the sinking-fund towards the discharge of part of it; and this in debate was called a misapplication of the sinking-fund; but nobody in either House pretended to find any material fault in the manner in which the debt had been incurred—not that there were no faults to be found, but the intricacy of the account, and the ignorance of those who had undertaken to sift it, kept those faults from the light.

The bill for Triennial Parliaments was proposed in the House of Commons [13*th March*], but rejected by a great majority [247 to 184], and never brought at all into the House of Lords.

The Prince's affair was often talked of in private, but never mentioned in either House. He contrived to irritate the Court by alarming them with caballing, and to disoblige those with whom he caballed by stopping

there, and not giving his consent to have it prosecuted in Parliament. The Tories and discontented Whigs were so dissatisfied with his conduct, that they abused him more than they did his father; and said that he had only drawn them in to make the offer of standing by him, that he might make a merit to his father of rejecting that offer and betraying them. On the other hand, his father and mother, though they were frightened out of their senses whenever they thought their son's name was near being mentioned in Parliament, whenever these fears abated, treated him in the most provoking manner, and spoke of him in the most contemptuous terms.

The Prince's character at his first coming over, though little more respectable, seemed much more amiable than, upon his opening himself further and being better known, it turned out to be; for though there appeared nothing in him to be admired, yet there seemed nothing in him to be hated—neither anything great nor anything vicious; his behaviour was something that gained one's good wishes, though it gave one no esteem for him; for his best qualities, whilst they prepossessed one the most in his favour, always gave one a degree of contempt for him at the same time; his carriage, whilst it seemed engaging to those who did not examine it, appearing mean to those who did: for though his manners had the show of benevolence from a good deal of natural or habitual civility, yet his cajoling everybody, and almost in an equal degree, made those things which might have been thought favours, if more judiciously or sparingly bestowed, lose all their weight. He carried this affectation of general benevolence so far that he often condescended below the character of a Prince;

and as people attributed this familiarity to popular, and not particular motives, so it only lessened their respect without increasing their good will, and instead of giving them good impressions of his humanity, only gave them ill ones of his sincerity. He was indeed as false as his capacity would allow him to be, and was more capable in that walk than in any other, never having the least hesitation, from principle or fear of future detection, in telling any lie that served his present purpose. He had a much weaker understanding, and, if possible, a more obstinate temper, than his father; that is, more tenacious of opinions he had once formed, though less capable of ever forming right ones. Had he had one grain of merit at the bottom of his heart, one should have had compassion for him in the situation to which his miserable poor head soon reduced him; for his case, in short, was this:—he had a father that abhorred him, a mother that despised him, sisters that betrayed him, a brother set up against him, and a set of servants that neglected him, and were neither of use, nor capable of being of use to him, nor desirous of being so.

Dodington,[1] who governed him, at present was afraid of having him quite reconciled to the King, or quite broke with him, foreseeing that in either of these situations the Prince would be inevitably taken out of

[1] George Bubb, author of the celebrated Diary, the son, according to one version, of an apothecary, or, according to another, of an Irish fortune-hunter (perhaps the same person). He inherited from his uncle, George Dodington, a great estate in Dorsetshire, and assumed his name (*ante*, p. 38). After quarrelling with the Prince, as we shall see presently, he was subsequently reconciled to him, and in 1749 became again his prime adviser. After the Prince's death in 1750, he attached himself to the Princess Dowager; and George III. rewarded his services to his parents by creating him, in 1761, Lord Melcombe. He died in July, 1762.

his hands. In the one he would be governed by his mother, and consequently by Sir Robert Walpole; in the other by Pulteney, Lord Chesterfield, or Lord Carteret, who, as heads of the party, could never have submitted to act a subordinate part to Mr. Dodington, whom no man but himself would have thought of a rank above them.

Other questions that were started by the Opposition during this session, as they were too immaterial to give much disturbance, so they were of too little consequence to be repeated. Nor ought anybody to wonder that things were no better concerted or managed against the Court, when those who naturally ought to have acted in concert for the management of these affairs were most of them as ill with one another as with those they opposed. Lord Carteret and Lord Bolingbroke had no correspondence at all; Mr. Pulteney and Lord Bolingbroke hated one another; Lord Carteret and Pulteney were jealous of one another; Sir William Wyndham and Pulteney the same; whilst Lord Chesterfield had a little correspondence with them all, but was confided in by none of them.

In pursuance of estimates given in from the Crown, 20,000 men were voted this year in Parliament for the sea service, and an augmentation of 1800 for the land forces. The demand for the sea service met with no opposition, and the other with much less than it would have done had the true reason for asking such an augmentation been avowed or known.

The pretence for asking it was this:—Two years before, when the Spaniards made their ridiculous expedition to Oran, the garrison of Gibraltar consisted only of 2400 men; and as Spain, whilst she was making

these vast preparations and armaments both by sea and land, thought it proper not to declare for what purpose they were designed, the English ministers, not knowing but some new attack upon Gibraltar might be intended, sent over three regiments upon the English[2] establishment, in all 1800 men, to strengthen that garrison.

Soon after, when the Spanish storm broke upon the African coast, and Gibraltar was thought in safety, these troops were ordered back; but, before those orders were executed, new troubles arising in Europe on the death of the King of Poland, and the turn Spain would take not being known, the orders for the return of these three regiments were retracted. The demand now made in Parliament therefore was explained to be in reality an augmentation for the garrison of Gibraltar, since these 1800 men were only desired to complete the number voted the year before for the English establishment, and to supply those three regiments the King had thought fit to remove from home for the security of that place.

This sounded plausibly; and in order to make the grant of this demand come easier, instead of three new regiments being raised, it was proposed to make the augmentation by the cheaper way of adding private men only to every company.

But the true reason of this augmentation was to secure the Ministry and strengthen the hands of the Government in case of insurrections, or any disturbances that might arise, whilst the nation was in the ferment of elections for a new Parliament. Sir Robert Walpole's apprehensions were very strong upon this

[2] The army used to be voted on *English*, *Irish*, and *Colonial* establishments.

score, and his reason for making the augmentation by adding private men to corps, instead of raising new entire corps, was not because he thought it the cheapest method, but because he looked upon it as the speediest and most effectual; new-raised regiments being in his opinion never of any use the first year, and the first year in this case being the time when he expected to have most use for them.[3]

The King and the Queen, who always considered soldiers as the principal supports both of their grandeur and their power, were glad of any pretence to increase their number, and caressed Sir Robert Walpole extremely for tracing out a way by which a thing they were so desirous of, and the whole nation so averse to, could be done with so little difficulty. So that he contrived to have all the merit of inventing this scheme to their Majesties, and to avoid all the odium of it among those of his adherents who disliked it, by saying it was a point on which the King was so peremptory and so obstinate, that it was impossible for him to avoid giving in to it; by which means he at once made his court to the King and Queen, his excuse to his friends, and a provision for his own security.

But this provision did not yet seem sufficient, and

[3] All this seems strange from a ministerial pen. A war had broken out on the Continent that seemed likely to embroil England and Spain—the preparation at Gibraltar was therefore indispensable. As to the motive Lord Hervey attributes to Walpole, it is enough to observe that the bill passed in March, and the dissolution was in April, so that the new levies, if such a thing were ever credible, were not very likely to be employed at these elections. The opposition tone which Lord Hervey here and hereabouts takes, and which is in direct contradiction to his votes and speeches, may be attributed to his ill humour, subsequently avowed, at not being in political office: he cavils at the decisions of a Cabinet to which he thought he ought to belong.

before the dissolution of the Parliament, at the very end of the session, he made this expiring Parliament on its deathbed leave him a legacy that was a full antidote to all his fears. This legacy (a *vote of credit* being an obnoxious title) was christened a *vote of confidence*—a name it richly deserved, for never in time of peace was so unlimited a confidence lodged in the hands of the Crown before. This vote of confidence not only gave the King a power during the interval of Parliament to augment his forces without limitation, both by land and sea, but a promissory note was tacked to it, of making good any engagements made or to be made by his Majesty for the interest, honour, and safety of the nation, or as the exigence of affairs should require. Authority by Act of Parliament also was given him to apply what sum he thought fit out of all the money granted for the current service of the year for these purposes, and all the security the Parliament had for no misapplication being made of this credit, nor any abuse of this power, was a little cajolery (inserted at the end of the message sent from the Crown to make this demand) that promised an account should be laid before the next Parliament of the use that had been made of the generosity of its predecessor.

This message was sent to both Houses, and the debates in both Houses upon it were very warm. Those who objected to this unlimited confidence being placed in the Crown said, though this vote was not called a vote of credit, yet it was in effect the most extensive, and consequently the most improper credit that was ever given to the Crown; that it would have been more

for the honour of Parliament, and less dangerous to the liberties of the people, to have voted any sum of money or any number of troops in the common Parliamentary methods at the beginning of the session, than to allow one man or one shilling to be raised in a manner so repugnant to the nature of our Constitution; that it was sapping the foundation and defeating the very end of Parliaments, as it was making a farce of granting money upon estimates, if, by an unappropriating clause, a power was afterwards given to the King of applying what was beneficially granted for one use to any other purpose he should think fit; and if promises were made, when that money was squandered in unnecessary expenses, that they would afterwards find more, to defray those charges that were necessary.

It was more than hinted, too, that this credit was asked by the King only to get money to buy a Parliament at the next elections, which Parliament would afterwards no doubt have gratitude enough to pass any account brought by their benefactor, or discharge any debt contracted in their service.

Those who spoke for this vote of confidence said that the reason why more money and troops were not demanded at the beginning of the session was, that, as the King could not know beforehand what situation the affairs of Europe would be in at the opening of the campaign, so the most that could possibly be wanted must have been asked had the demand been made then, whereas, a discretionary power being now lodged in the Crown to measure the expenses of the nation by the necessity of the occasion, and to proportion it to the call, the least that could be wanted might be applied:

consequently, in one case the nation might have been put to an unnecessary charge; in the other, without an abuse of this power supposed, there need not one farthing be expended more than the circumstances of the times absolutely require.

That as to the misapplication of money, as an account was to be laid before Parliament of all that was disbursed in consequence of this vote, so the Parliament would be as good judges, by a subsequent account as by a previous estimate, whether the expense was necessarily incurred or not: and a minister would be as much responsible with his head for any abuse that should be made of it as he would be for taking any sum of money granted for one purpose and applying it to another.

It was further urged that, the French fleet lying then in sight of our coasts, if the enemies to this Government had counselled France to take the opportunity of the confusion of elections and the interval of Parliament to give us any molestation, it would not be very advisable to seem improvident against such an undertaking; nor could it be called a blow to the Constitution for the Parliament previously to counsel the King in such circumstances to do that in defence of his crown and people, which, if occasion required, he must do without their counsel.

After a very long debate in both Houses, the question was carried in both by a great majority. In the House of Lords a very strong protest was made against it, but strong protests were grown so frequent that they were little regarded. The only use they were of was, when they were printed at the end of the session, and dispersed like pamphlets about the country, to raise clamour

against the Administration, and create disaffection to the Government; and as these ennobled "*Craftsmen*," signed with the names of thirty or forty people of the first quality and consideration in the kingdom, tallied with the anonymous "*Craftsmen*," so these annual invectives gave weight to those weekly libels, and added the force of authority to the natural insinuation of censure and calumny.

Nor was writing ever in England at a higher pitch, either for learning, strength of diction, or elegance of style, than in this reign. All the good writing, too, was confined to political topics,[4] either of civil, military, or ecclesiastical government, and all the tracts on these subjects printed in pamphlets. It might very properly be called the Augustan age of England for this kind of writing; not that there was any similitude between the two princes who presided in the Roman and English Augustan ages besides their names, for George *Augustus* neither loved learning nor encouraged men of letters, nor were there any Mæcenases about him. There was another very material difference too between these two Augustuses—as personal courage was the only quality necessary to form a great prince which the one was suspected to want, so I fear it was the only one the other was ever thought to possess.

I must now give an account of the marriage of the Princess Royal, which I ought to have done previously

[4] Though many of the pamphlets of the day were very able, and Lord Hervey's own amongst the ablest, yet it is too much to say that "all good writing was confined to political topics." And in truth, the two preceding reigns are more commonly admitted to have been our *Augustan* age—while that of George II. is generally thought the lowest of any in literary merit.

to the account of the vote of confidence, as it preceded it about three weeks.

The Prince of Orange returned to Somerset House from the Bath the beginning of March in perfect health, and on the 14th of that month he was married. A covered gallery (through which the procession passed) was built from the King's apartment quite round the palace garden to the little French chapel adjoining to St. James's House (where the ceremony was performed).[5] The gallery held four thousand people, was very finely illuminated, and, by the help of three thousand men who were that day upon guard, the whole was performed with great regularity and order, as well as splendour and magnificence. Lord Hervey had the care of the ceremonial, and drew the plan for the order of the procession, with which nobody but the Irish peers was dissatisfied. They insisted on walking in the procession, every class of them, at the end of the English and Scotch peers of the same rank; but as the English Barons would not give place to the Irish Earls and Viscounts, Lord Hervey chose rather to disoblige these than the English peers, who declared they would not walk at all if any of the Irish were placed before them. Upon Lord Hervey's sticking to the point of leaving them quite out of the procession unless they would walk all together in a separate body (which he offered and they refused), they presented a petition to

[5] The old Duchess of Marlborough, who could see this gallery from her windows, and who liked none of the parties to the pageant, was indignant at its standing so long during the delay of the wedding. "I wonder," she asked, "when my neighbour George will remove his *orange-chest*," — "which in fact," adds Horace Walpole, who was old enough to remember it, "it did resemble."—*Reminiscences.*

the King to do them what they called justice. The King and the Queen were both inclined to comply with their request; but upon Lord Hervey's telling the Queen that if they were indulged in this demand no English peer below the rank of an Earl[6] would appear at all, and that the whole body of the English peerage would take it ill, the King only referred the petition of the Irish peers to the Cabinet Council, gave no answer to it, and let the matter drop. The House of Lords was not thought at this time to be in such a temper or situation with regard to the Court as made it advisable to run any risk of disobliging them (for this dispute arose in October, when the wedding-day was first appointed, and before the Parliament met). All the indignation of the Irish peers fell on Lord Hervey; the Duke of Grafton (the Chamberlain), who loved temporising, having insinuated to them that he had nothing to do with this affair, and that Lord Hervey had taken the whole into his hands. When Lord Gage, an Irish Viscount, and a petulant, silly, busy, meddling, profligate fellow, asked Lord Hervey why he had made no mention of the Irish peers in the ceremonial, Lord Hervey said, because, the Irish House of Lords being now sitting, he concluded they were all at Dublin, and that no *Englishman* could suppose them capable of being in two places at once.[7] Lord Gage *said* it was very hard they might not have the same privileges on this occasion that they had on others. Lord Hervey answered that the last time this thing had been disputed

[6] There being then no Irish peers above the rank of Earl.

[7] This pleasantry was, after all, the best argument that could be alleged against the Irish peers.

was on the creation of the Knights of the Bath; that the younger sons of English Earls had then refused to give place to the Irish Earl of Inchiquin and the Irish Viscount Tyrconnel; and that the expedient then found out to adjust the dispute was giving the ribbon to these two noble Lords by themselves the day after all the others received it: if, therefore, the Irish Lords pleased to terminate the present dispute the same way, he said he had no objection to it; the gallery should be left standing, and the Irish Lords, if they pleased, should walk the next day. Lord Gage and all the other Irish Lords to whom he repeated this conversation were very angry, as may easily be imagined, with Lord Hervey, and, had they not said a thousand impertinent things before of Lord Hervey, he would certainly have been in the wrong to have said this. The Scotch and English Lords, however, were extremely pleased with his conduct in this affair, and as much displeased with my Lord Chamberlain's; applauding the one for having so strenuously asserted the rights of the Peers of Great Britain, and equally condemning the other for having shown himself so ready to give them up. His Grace acted on this occasion as he did on most others, which was to decline acting at all, and consequently to disoblige those most who were most in the right; people who have justice on their side always looking upon neutrality as injury, and being to the full as much piqued against those whose business it is to stand by them for not declaring for them as if they declared against them.

The King once told the Duke of Grafton upon another occasion, that his Grace was always balancing

whether he should speak truth or flatter those whom truth would disoblige.

His Grace's maxim was never to give a direct answer either to the most material or most indifferent question; so that the natural cloud of his understanding, thickened by the artificial cloud of his mistaken Court policy, made his meaning always as unintelligible as his conversation was unentertaining. By coming very young into the great world, being of great quality, and formerly very handsome, he had always kept the best company; and by living perpetually at Court he had all the routine of that style of conversation which is a sort of gold-leaf, that is a great embellishment where it is joined to anything else, but makes a very poor figure by itself. To pass one's time with people who have only that *agrément*, in my opinion surfeits one as soon as feeding upon sugar; which, though it heightens the relish of many things it is mixed with, would quickly turn one's stomach if one was to eat it alone.

The hour appointed for all those who were to walk in the procession to assemble was seven at night. The bridegroom, with all the men, was in the Great Council Chamber; the bride, with all the ladies, in the Great Drawing-room; and the King and Queen, with their children and servants, in the King's lesser Drawing-room. The Prince of Orange's whole retinue was as magnificent as gold and silver varied in brocade lace and embroidery could make them, and the jewels he gave the Princess of immense value, particularly the necklace, which was so large that twenty-two diamonds made the whole round of her neck.[8] * *

[8] Lord Hervey had thought it worth while to insert here the order of

The chapel was fitted up with an extreme good taste, and as much finery as velvets, gold and silver tissue, galloons, fringes, tassels, gilt lustres and sconces could give. The King spared no expense on this occasion; but if he had not loved a show better than his daughter, he would have chosen rather to have given her this money to make her circumstances easy, than to have laid it out in making her wedding splendid.

He behaved himself well during the ceremony; but her mother and sisters were under so much undisguised and unaffected concern the whole time, that the procession to the chapel, and the scene there, looked more like the mournful pomp of a sacrifice than the joyful celebration of a marriage; and put one rather in mind of an Iphigenia leading to the altar than of a bride.

The Prince of Orange was a less shocking and less ridiculous figure in this pompous procession and at supper than one could naturally have expected such an Æsop, in such trappings and such eminence, to have appeared. He had a long peruke like hair that flowed all over his back, and hid the roundness of it; and as his countenance was not bad, there was nothing very strikingly disagreeable about his stature.

But when he was undressed, and came in his nightgown and nightcap into the room to go to bed,[9] the

---

the procession, extracted from the 'London Gazette,' 16th March, 1734, with a reference to which the reader will, I hope, be satisfied.

[9] The grossness of this sort of exhibition used to be carried even further. The Duke de St. Simon, who in 1722 accompanied Mdlle. d'Orléans to Spain to be married to the Prince of the Asturias, takes great praise to himself for having over persuaded "the modesty and gravity" of Spanish etiquette to submit on that occasion to the *French custom* of having the whole Court introduced to see the young couple actually in bed: and we

appearance he made was as indescribable as the astonished countenances of everybody who beheld him. From the shape of his brocaded gown, and the make of his back, he looked behind as if he had no head, and before as if he had no neck and no legs. The Queen, in speaking of the whole ceremony next morning alone with Lord Hervey, when she came to mention this part of it, said, "*Ah! mon Dieu! quand je voiois entrer ce monstre, pour coucher avec ma fille, j'ai pensé m'évanouir; je chancelois auparavant, mais ce coup là m'a assommée. Dites moi, my Lord Hervey, avez vous bien remarqué et considéré ce monstre dans ce moment? et n'aviez vous pas bien pitié de la pauvre Anne? Bon Dieu! c'est trop sotte en moi, mais j'en pleure encore.*" Lord Hervey turned the discourse as fast as he was able, for this was a circumstance he could not soften and would not exaggerate. He only said, "Oh! Madam, in half a year all persons are alike; the figure of the body one's married to, like the prospect of the place one lives at, grows so familiar to one's eyes, that one looks at it mechanically, without regarding either the beauties or deformities that strike a stranger." "One may, and I believe one does (replied the Queen), grow blind at last; but you must allow, my dear Lord Hervey, there is a great difference, as long as one sees, in the manner of one's growing blind."

The sisters spoke much in the same style as the mother, with horror of his figure, and great commiseration of the fate of his wife. Princess Emily said (how truly is doubtful), nothing upon earth should have in-

shall see by and bye, on the occasion of Prince Frederic's marriage, that it was also a custom of the *English* Court.

duced her to marry the monster. Princess Caroline, in her soft sensible way, spoke truth, and said she must own it was very bad; but that, in her sister's situation, all things considered, she believed she should have come to the same resolution.

What seems most extraordinary was, that, from the time of their being married till they went out of England, Lord Hervey (who was perpetually with them, and at whose lodgings they passed whole evenings) said that she always behaved to him as if he had been an Adonis, and that he hardly ever took any notice at all of her. She made prodigious court to him,[10] addressed everything she said to him, and applauded everything he said to anybody else.

The Prince of Wales forced himself to be tolerably civil to the Prince of Orange during his stay here; but with the Queen and the Princess Royal he kept so little measure, that the one he never saw but in public, and the other he hardly ever spoke to either in public or private.

One of his wise quarrels with the Princess Royal was her *daring to be married before him*, and consenting to take a portion from the Parliament, and an establishment from her father, before those honours and favours were conferred upon him. As if her being married prevented his being so, or that the daughter should decline being settled because her father declined the settling of her brother.[11]

10 Nor did Lord Hervey himself omit to make his court. He solicited the Prince to stand sponsor with the Princesses Emily and Caroline to a new-born daughter, who in consequence was christened *Emily-Caroline-Nassau*. She died unmarried in 1814, æt. 80.

11 Lord Hervey does not mention an interview which the Prince had with the King about this time, which made some noise, and rather, it

Another judicious subject of his enmity was her supporting Handel, a German musician and composer (who had been her singing master, and was now undertaker of one of the operas), against several of the nobility who had a pique with Handel, and had set up another person to ruin him; or, to speak more properly and exactly, the Prince, in the beginning of his enmity to his sister, set himself at the head of the other opera to irritate her, whose pride and passions were as strong as her brother's (although his understanding was so much weaker), and could brook contradiction, where she dared to resent it, as little as her father.

---

seems, widened the breach. About the beginning of July, M. de Loss, the Saxon minister, wrote to his Court—

"Ten or twelve days ago the Prince of Wales went to the ante-chamber and requested an audience, which he obtained as soon as Sir Robert Walpole, whom the King had sent for, was gone out of the closet. This audience is much talked of, and turned, as it is said, on the following points:—

"1. To have permission of serving a campaign on the Rhine; 2. To request an augmentation of his income, the Prince insinuating that he was in debt. (N.B. Of 100,000*l.* granted to the Prince by Parliament out of the Civil List, only 36,000*l.* is paid to him, the remainder is appropriated by the King.) 3. He represented the necessity of a proper marriage.

"To the first the King made no reply. In regard to the second, the King is said to have given some hopes, on condition that he would behave better to the Queen. It is reported the King was displeased with this step. Many persons suspect that the Opposition advised the Prince to act in this manner. *Relata refero.*"

And on the 16th July M. Johnn, the Danish envoy, writes—

"The Queen strives to prevent the ill consequences likely to result from the late conversation between the King and Prince of Wales. Hopes are entertained of satisfying the Prince by a sum of money for the payment of his debts; but as the article of his marriage is that which most interests him, and as it is precisely that which will not be granted, it will be extremely difficult to prevent the business from being laid before the ensuing Parliament. Those who advised the Prince to take this step probably calculated that an irreconcileable quarrel would have been the consequence; but Sir Robert Walpole, whom the King consulted before he admitted the Prince, disposed his Majesty to moderation on so delicate an occasion."—*Coxe's Walpole*, iii. 169.

What I have related may seem a trifle; but though the cause was indeed such, the effects of it were no trifles. The King and Queen were as much in earnest upon this subject as their son and daughter, though they had the prudence to disguise it, or to endeavour to disguise it, a little more. They were both Handelists, and sat freezing constantly at his empty Haymarket Opera, whilst the Prince with all the chief of the nobility went as constantly to that of Lincoln's Inn Fields. The affair grew as serious as that of the *Greens* and the *Blues* under Justinian at Constantinople; an anti-Handelist was looked upon as an anti-courtier; and voting against the Court in Parliament was hardly a less remissible or more venial sin than speaking against Handel or going to the Lincoln's Inn Fields Opera. The Princess Royal said she expected in a little while to see half the House of Lords playing in the orchestra in their robes and coronets; and the King—though he declared he took no other part in this affair than subscribing 1000*l.* a-year to Handel—often added at the same time that "he did not think setting oneself at the head of a *faction* of fiddlers a very honourable occupation for people of quality; or the ruin of one poor fellow [Handel] so generous or so good-natured a scheme as to do much honour to the undertakers, whether they succeeded or not; but the better they succeeded in it, the more he thought they would have reason to be ashamed of it." The Princess Royal quarrelled with the Lord Chamberlain for affecting his usual neutrality on this occasion, and spoke of Lord Delaware, who was one of the chief managers against Handel, with as much spleen as if he had been at the head of

the Dutch faction who opposed the making her husband Stadtholder.[12]

Another cause of the Prince of Wales's wrath to his mother and his sisters was the having Lord Hervey perpetually with them; and a gold snuff-box the Queen bespoke, with *Arts* and *Sciences* engraved upon it, and gave to Lord Hervey, the Prince said was less in favour to Lord Hervey, than to insult and outrage him.

But to return to the chapter of the marriage. The two Houses on this occasion addressed the King, and sent messages of congratulation to the Queen. Lord Scarborough, in the House of Lords, moved the message to the Queen, and Lord Chesterfield, officiously thrusting[13] himself in to second him, was appointed by the House with Lord Scarborough and Lord Hardwicke to carry it.

Lord Chesterfield being the eldest Peer, it was his right to deliver the message and speak to the Queen: as he had never been at Court since the day after he was turned out, nor had ever been presented upon his marriage, the Queen determined to receive him as an Earl sent by the House of Lords whom she had never seen before in her life. He said he designed this step as a compliment to the Queen, and to show that he had no rancour except to Sir Robert Walpole; but she, who knew how he talked of her, and hated him as heartily

---

[12] The great question depending in Holland, whether the Prince of Orange should be declared Stadtholder. See *Chesterfield Correspondence*, iii. 40.

[13] Lord Chesterfield's recent employment at the Hague, and his concern in the preliminaries of this marriage, justified his interference—though no doubt it had a tinge of *opposition* in it.

as he did her, spoke of his conduct in presuming to force himself into this embassy as the greatest impertinence that he could be guilty of, and said that, as his capacity was capable of nothing but making jokes, so he had a mind to turn a compliment paid to her by the House of Lords into one; or that he imagined perhaps his august, considerable figure would awe and disconcert her; but that he would find it was as little in his power for his presence to embarrass her, as for his raillery behind her back to pique her, or his consummate skill in politics to distress the King or his ministers.

The Queen was to receive this message in her bedchamber, with nobody present but the three messengers, her children, and the servants in waiting; but Lord Hervey, thinking the interview would be something curious, asked her leave (which she granted) to stand behind her.

Lord Chesterfield's speech was well written and well got by heart, and yet delivered with a faltering voice, a face as white as a sheet, and every limb trembling with concern.

The Queen's answer was great and natural, and delivered with the same ease that she would have spoken to the most indifferent person in her circle.

She always disliked Lord Chesterfield, owned it, and used to say that it was because he had always disliked her. "*Dicax enim, illam acerbis facetiis irridere solitus, quarum apud præpotentes in longum memoria est:*"—"He had a ready wit, and was in the habit of ridiculing her with bitter jests, which stick long and deep in the memory of the great."—(*Ta-*

citus.) This remark was verified between the Queen and Lord Chesterfield, by whom she had been often this way provoked, and never forgot it nor forgave it. She has often told me that she knew at Leicester Fields,[14] he used formerly to turn her into ridicule; but that she had then frequently between jest and earnest advised him not to provoke her; telling him at the same time that, though she acknowledged he had more wit than her, yet she would assure him she had a most bitter tongue, and would certainly pay him any debts of that kind with most exorbitant interest. She said he always used to deny the fact, and do it again the moment he got out of the room, or if she turned her head, without staying till he had turned his back. For a man of parts, the choosing to make his court to the King rather than to the Queen, and to Lord Townshend rather than Sir Robert Walpole, was a most unaccountable conduct, unless he thought the people that were easiest deceived were the likeliest for him to please, and that nobody was capable of being made his friend but in the same degree that they were capable of being made his dupes.

The City of London, the University of Oxford, and several other disaffected towns and incorporated bodies, took the opportunity of the Princess Royal's marriage to say the most impertinent things to the King, under the pretence of complimental addresses, that ironical zeal and couched satire could put together. The tenor of them all was to express their satisfaction in this match, from remembering how much this country was

[14] Lord Chesterfield was of the Court of George II. when Prince of Wales.

indebted to a Prince who bore the title of Orange; declaring their gratitude to his memory, and intimating, as plainly as they dared, how much they wished this man might follow the example of his great ancestor, and one time or other *depose his father-in-law* in the same manner that King William had deposed his.

The address of the City of London was thus epitomised in verse:—

> "Most gracious Sire, behold before you
> Your prostrate subjects that adore you—
> The Mayor and Citizens of London,
> By loss of trade and taxes undone,
> Who come with gratulation hearty,
> Altho' they 're of the Country Party,
> To wish your Majesty much cheer
> On Anna's marriage with Myn'heer.
> Our hearts presage, from this alliance,
> The fairest hopes, the brightest triumphs;
> For if one Revolution glorious
> Has made us wealthy and victorious,
> Another, by just consequence,
> Must double both our power and pence:
> We therefore hope that young Nassau,
> Whom you have chose your son-in-law,
> Will show himself of William's stock,
> And prove a chip of the same block."

By a blunder of the Duke of Grafton's—who always blundered nor ever knew what he was about, and had lived in a Court all his life without knowing even the common forms of it—when the City of London brought their address, none of those who presented it had the honour to kiss the King's hand. This was immediately told all over the kingdom; not as the effect of my Lord Chamberlain's negligence and ignorance, which indeed it was, but as a mark of the King's resentment of the purport of the City of London's address: and

everybody who believed the thing in this manner condemned the King for giving those who meant to be impertinent to him the pleasure of seeing he understood them.

It is certain at this time the Court was very unpopular, that the King and Queen were as much personally hated as Sir Robert Walpole, and both spoken and wrote against with as much freedom: but they were not so sensible as he was of the situation they were in; particularly the King, who imagined those courtiers and flatterers that were perpetually incensing his altars in the palace, spoke the sentiments of all his subjects, though in reality they were as far from speaking the opinion of the nation as their own, and were no more the echoes of other people's words than they were the communicators of their own thoughts.

What I am going to say may sound paradoxical; but it is my firm opinion, though I know not how to account for it, that, although money and troops are generally esteemed the nerves and sinews of all the regal power, and that no king ever had so large a civil list or so large an army in time of peace as the present King, yet that the Crown was never less capable of infringing the liberties of this country than at this time; and that the spirit of liberty was so universally breathed into the breasts of the people, that, if any violent act of power had been attempted, at no era would it have been more difficult to perpetrate any undertaking of that kind. The King was often told, both in Parliament and in print, that his crown had been the gift of the people; that it was given on conditions;

and that it behoved him to observe those conditions, as it would be both as easy and as lawful, in case he broke any of them, for the people to resume that gift, as it had been for them to bestow it.

The Prince, who always imagined himself the idol of the people, was to the full as unpopular as his parents. And though on this occasion of the Prince of Orange's wedding, he might plainly have seen that he was quite dropped, and that those who wished to get rid of his father never desired to exchange his father for him, yet nothing could open his eyes, the bandage of vanity bound them so close, and so determined he was to believe that every discontent centered in the King, the Queen, and Sir Robert Walpole, and that all the nation wished as much as he himself, that the time was come for him to ascend the throne.

Some mortification, however, he could not help feeling, and showing in his countenance, when, upon going to the play once or twice with the Prince of Orange, the galleries when he came into the box only made a little clapping as usual with their hands, and the moment the Prince of Orange appeared the whole house rung with peals of shouts and huzzas.

The King himself began before the Prince of Orange went away to be very uneasy at distinctions of this kind that were paid him, and could not contentedly see, every opera-night from his own window, the coach of the Prince of Orange surrounded by crowds and ushered out of Court with incessant hallooing, whilst his own chair followed the moment after through empty and silent streets.

Nor were the States of Holland less jealous of the Prince of Orange's popularity in that country than the King was concerned at it in this; but the jealousy of the one, and the concern of the other, were not equally well founded; there being but little danger of the Prince of Orange's subverting the Government here and making himself King, whereas the inferior people in Holland were so strenuous in his cause, and the spirits of his party so raised by his new alliance, that his being one day or other Stadtholder there was an event whose probability made apprehension much more justifiable.

This being his present position both in England and Holland, the King grew in haste to be rid of him, whilst those who had the power there were unwilling to receive him: so unwilling they were and so afraid of his presence causing an immediate insurrection of the populace in his favour, that it was privately intimated to him here from the chief people of that country, who then presided in the government of it, that they hoped he would not think of passing through Holland to Friesland,[15] but go directly thither by sea.

Horace Walpole, who the year before was sent into Holland to treat of the affairs of Europe, under the pretence of going to fetch the Prince of Orange, now made the affairs of Europe a pretence for going to settle those of the Prince; but all he could obtain for

[15] Of which province, as is stated in the next page, he was hereditary Stadtholder. The authorities of the province of Holland, and especially of Amsterdam, were opposed to the election of the Prince of Orange, while the people were all for him; and his very passage through the province became a source of danger to the existing Government. See *ante*, p. 273, n. 2, where the reference should have been to *this* page.

the Prince was a permission to land with his bride at Rotterdam, and pass to Amsterdam with the utmost expedition and privacy, in order to re-embark there for Friesland. One thing more he obtained for the Princess Royal, which was, that, when she came to the Hague in her return to England, she was to have the offer of a guard on condition she would refuse it; and a further stipulation there was for the making the offer, which was, that the Prince of Orange should not be in the way when she received the military ambassador who brought it, because, in that case, this messenger would be obliged to distinguish between the husband and the wife, and assure the first he was not designed to have any share in this compliment paid to the last.

The Prince of Orange was hereditary Stadtholder of Friesland, and Stadtholder by election of Gröningen and Guelderland.

Though the principal reason of Horace Walpole's expedition to Holland was the regulation of the Prince of Orange's reception there, yet he took occasion at the same time to feel anew the pulse of the Pensionary [Slingelandt] and great people there with regard to the present situation of Europe, and was extremely mortified to find them beat so calmly that there was no hope of raising that fever of war with which he wished so much to infect them. Besides the making his court to the King and Queen by endeavouring to bring the Dutch to more vigorous measures, he had a personal interest in it; for, as he felt himself ignorant of domestic affairs, and fancied himself perfectly master of foreign negotiations; as he declared he made no figure in Parliament, or rather a ridiculous one; and that he

flattered himself he shone brighter than any man in embassies and despatches, so he wished to turn the scene of business entirely on that side, and desired to do by England as he did by himself, which was to have it engaged to its discredit rather than lie idle—though in France it must be owned, by the interest he had in the Cardinal, he did England service; but how he got that interest in the Cardinal was very extraordinary. The two things in Mr. Walpole which his Eminence told Monsieur Chavigny[16] gained most upon him were his blunt behaviour and his manner of living with his wife: the one he said gave him a good opinion of Mr. Walpole's sincerity, and the other of his morality; so that Horace had the good fortune to succeed abroad by the very two qualities which drew the most contempt and ridicule upon him at home, which were the coarseness of his manners and the depravity of his taste. For the wife to whom he showed all this goodness was a tailor's daughter, whom he had married for interest, with a form scarce human, as offensive to the nose and the ears as to the eyes, and one to whom he was kind, not from any principle of gratitude, but from the bestiality of his inclination.[17]

Horace Walpole, with all his defects, was certainly a very good treaty-dictionary, to which his brother often

[16] At this time French Minister in London.

[17] She was, says the Peerage, the daughter of "Peter Lombard, Esq.," whom the old Duchess of Marlborough used to delight to call "*my tailor*." I know not what her person may have been, but Horace the younger, who hated her, admitted that she on one occasion at least exhibited a temper and good taste "almost sublime." When presented at the Court of France, the Queen asked her "De quelle famille êtes-vous, Madame?" Mrs. Walpole answered modestly, "*D'aucune*." The paragraph in the text does, I think, more discredit to Lord Hervey's taste than to Mr. Walpole's.

referred for facts necessary for him to be informed of, and of which he was capable of making good use; but to hear Horace himself talk on these subjects unrestrained, and without being turned to any particular point, was listening to a rhapsody that was never coherent, and often totally unintelligible.[18] This made his long and frequent speeches in Parliament uneasy to his own party, ridiculous to the other, and tiresome to both. He loved business, had great application, and was indefatigable; but, from having a most unclear head, no genius, no method, and a most loose inconclusive manner of reasoning, he was absolutely useless to his brother in every capacity but that which I have already mentioned of a dictionary. He was a very disagreeable man in company, noisy, overbearing, affecting to be always jocose, and thoroughly the *mauvais plaisant;* as unbred in his dialect as in his apparel, and as ill bred in his discourse as in his behaviour and gestures; with no more of the look than the habits of a gentleman. A free, easy, cheerful manner of conversing made some people mistake him enough to think him good-natured; but he was far from it, and did many ill offices to people, and never that I heard of any good ones. Nor did he, with all the credit he was known to have with his brother, ever make one friend. Sir Robert was really humane, did friendly things, and one might say of him, as Pliny said of Trajan, and as nobody could say of his brother or his master, "*amicos*

[18] I think Lord Hervey was somehow personally biassed against Mr. Walpole, whose letters and despatches give a very much better impression of his abilities and judgment. I must, however, admit that his Lordship's estimate is nearly identical with that of Mr. Walpole's nephew and namesake.

habuit, quia amicus fuit:"—"He had friends, because he was a friend." Horace was envious, revengeful, inveterate, and implacable; but, from being afraid of his enemies, he had a behaviour towards them which many of them called good-humour, mistaking his timidity for serenity, and thinking, because he did not dare to strike, that he did not wish to wound.[19]

Whilst Horace was in Holland the Parliament was dissolved; the job of the vote of confidence being over, and a bill to enable the King to settle 5000*l.* a-year out of the civil-list revenues on the Princess Royal for her life being passed, the Court had no further occasion for the Parliament sitting, and everybody grew impatient to put an end to their expense and trouble by hastening to the new elections and getting them over.

After all the solicitude the Opposition had shown to pay compliments to the Prince of Orange by taking the lead in proposing a bill for his naturalization, they were weak and imprudent enough in the House of Commons to oppose this bill for the Princess Royal, and to divide upon it. The Prince [of Wales] disliked it in his heart; but when some of those who opposed it in the House said they were against it because it looked like a distrust of her brother, Dodington, as first Minister to the Prince, got up and told the House he had authority from the Prince to give his Royal Highness's assent to this bill, and declare his approbation of it.

The King's Speech at the end of this session of Par-

[19] "Willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike."

It is curious to find this allusion, which could hardly have been accidental, to the same satire of Pope's in which Lord Hervey himself figures as *Sporus*. The satire appeared in 1734, and Lord Hervey must have written this portion of the Memoirs very shortly after.

liament was on Tuesday the 16th day of April, 1734;[20] and the day after the Speech two Proclamations came out, the one for the dissolution of this Parliament, and the other for calling a new one.

Upon the rising of the Parliament, Mr. Onslow, the Speaker of the House of Commons,[21] was made Treasurer of the Navy, in the room of Lord Torrington.[22] Lord Torrington was not disgraced, but was put into the Vice-Treasurership of Ireland, in the place of Lord Falmouth, who had talked and voted himself out of a better employment than he ever deserved, or would ever be able to talk or vote himself into again. His agreeable and respectable situation at present was being despised as insignificant by those he abandoned, and laughed at for a fool by those to whom he deserted.

Lord Stair, at the same time, had his regiment taken from him, the King saying he would never let a man keep anything by favour who had endeavoured to keep it by force—alluding to Lord Stair's having voted for the bill to make the officers' commissions for life. Lord Stair, as soon as he was broke, wrote a letter to the Queen, and gave it to her Lord Chamberlain[23] to deliver to her. Lord Grantham, who was for ever in doubt what he should do, and always at last determined to

---

[20] Lord Hervey had again extracted the speech from the Gazette, where, as well as in all the books of reference, the curious reader may find it.

[21] Until the Speakership of Mr. Addington in 1789, when first there was a fixed salary voted for that office, it was very objectionably paid by fees, and by some lucrative office under the Crown.

[22] Pattee, second Lord Torrington.

[23] Henry de Nassau d'Auverquerque, second Earl of Grantham, Lord Chamberlain to the Queen. He was the son of one of King William's generals, (a branch of the Nassau family,) so created in 1698.

do what he should not, charged himself with this letter, and, without saying from whom he had it, carried it to the Queen. The Queen, opening it and looking immediately at the name, fell upon Lord Grantham for drawing her into this unpleasant scrape, and, without reading the letter, bid Lord Grantham carry it immediately to Sir Robert Walpole, and desired him to show it the King; by which means she very dexterously avoided the danger of concealing such a letter from the King, or giving Sir Robert Walpole any cause of jealousy from showing it. The letter set forth the deplorable state of this country, both from the power of France abroad and from Sir Robert Walpole at home; and all the effect it had on the King was making him call Lord Stair a puppy for writing it, and Lord Grantham a fool for bringing it.

In a few days after the Parliament was up [*22nd April*], the Princess Royal and Prince of Orange embarked at Greenwich for Holland: never was there a more melancholy parting than between her Royal Highness and all her family, except her brother—who took no leave of her at all, and desired the Prince of Orange to let her know his reason for omitting it was the fear of touching her too much. Her father gave her a thousand kisses and a shower of tears, but not one guinea.

Her mother never ceased crying for three days; but after three weeks (excepting on post-days) her Royal Highness seemed as much forgotten as if she had been buried three years. So quick a smoother is absence of the deepest impressions royal minds are capable of receiving. Impressions that are only to be preserved

by an effort of memory and reflection are indeed, in all human compositions, like characters written in sand, that, if they are not perpetually retained by our senses, they are seldom of any great duration, and are easily effaced, though ever so strongly marked.

Whilst the Princess lay wind-bound at Gravesend Lord Hervey went, by her desire, to make her a visit: and here it was, by being closeted two or three hours with the Prince of Orange, Lord Hervey found his bride had already made him so well acquainted with this Court, that there was nobody belonging to it whose character, even to the most minute particulars, was not as well known to him as their face. The Prince of Orange had a good deal of drollery, and, whilst Lord Hervey was delivering the compliments of St. James's to him, he asked him, smiling, what message he had brought from the Prince? Lord Hervey said his departure was so sudden that he had not seen the Prince. "If you had" (replied the Prince of Orange), "it would have been all one, since he was not more likely to send his sister a message than he was to make your Lordship his ambassador." Lord Hervey was a good deal surprised to hear the Prince of Orange speak so freely on this subject, and did not think it very discreet in him; but he was still more surprised when his Highness proceeded to open himself so much on the Prince of Wales's character as made it not hard to discover that his affection to the Prince's person, his opinion of his understanding, his dependence on his truth, and his esteem for his integrity, were all much at the same pitch. He told Lord Hervey what the

Prince had said about taking leave of his sister, at which they both smiled. He then acquainted Lord Hervey how often the Prince had entertained him with the recital of his Lordship's ingratitude—a subject on which Lord Hervey begged his Highness to spare him, since it must be extremely disagreeable to anybody to listen to one's own accusation when they were determined never to enter into their defence. The Prince of Orange, however, went on, and talked of Miss Vane,[24] and bade Lord Hervey not be too proud of that boy, since he had heard from very good authority it was the child of a triumvirate, and that the Prince and Lord Harrington had full as good a title to it as himself. Lord Hervey told the Prince of Orange that his speaking to him in this strain was not only the most effectual, but the most disagreeable method he could take to impose silence upon him, and begged they might either change the topic of their conversation or go to the company below stairs. The Prince of

---

[24] This unfortunate lady was, Horace Walpole tells us, the cause of the quarrel between the Prince and Lord Hervey.—*Reminiscences.* "Miss Vane, one of the maids of honour to the Queen, was sister of the first Lord Darlington, and mistress of Frederick Prince of Wales, by whom she had a son, publicly christened, in 1732, *Fitz-Frederick* Vane. She lay-in with little mystery in St. James's Palace, and yet it was doubted whether the Prince was really the parent. Lord Hervey was suspected of being a still more favoured lover; and Horace Walpole says that the Prince, Lord Hervey, and the first Lord Harrington, *each* confided to Sir Robert Walpole that *he* was the father of the child. It died in 1736, and its unhappy mother in a few months after."—*Suffolk Cor.*, i. 407. The coolness between the Prince and Lord Hervey seems to have begun towards the close of 1731, and its progress may be traced in a few expressions of his private letters, but he carefully omits all reference to the cause of quarrel. We shall see, however, by and by, that Miss Vane had probably a great share in it.

Orange, seeing him really uneasy and embarrassed, began to talk of the affairs of Europe, and showed he was as well informed of the interests of all foreign Courts as he was of the anecdotes of this.

When Lord Hervey took his leave of the Princess Royal, she bid him be sure to do his utmost to prevent a peace being made, and to make her mamma warm. The reason was, because, the war continuing, the Prince of Orange was to go a tour this campaign to the Imperial Army, and she in that case would return during his absence to England. Besides this, if the war continued, she thought Holland would be brought into it; and if Holland was brought into it, a Stadtholder would be more likely to be made. So that her pleasure in present, and her ambition in future, were both concerned in her solicitude for no end to be put to the murder, rapine, distress, and calamity that at present raged in Europe. And when one reflects on the influence the counsels of England had at this time on the fate of Europe—the influence the Queen had on those counsels, and the influence her daughter then had upon her—when, by this chain of causes, one considers what might turn the scale, and decide upon the lives and deaths of thousands, the destruction or preservation of many cities, the tranquillity or distress of whole nations, and the prosperity or adversity of half Europe —what respect it must give one for the hands of the few who regulate these great events; and with what confidence, resignation, content, and security must subjects commit the welfare of kingdoms to the justice and judgment of those mortal deities, their Princes, when

they see and know them actuated by such motives, and determined by such reasons![25]

The day the Princess set sail from Gravesend the King and Queen retired to Richmond, where they waited the account of every election under as much anxiety as if their Crown had been at stake. The complexion of the new Parliament was, indeed, of great moment to them; for never was an opposing party more exasperated against a Court, or a stiffer struggle made to distress it.

Notwithstanding the severe Act passed in the year 1729 to prevent bribery and corruption in elections, yet money, though it had been formerly more openly given, was never more plentifully issued than in these. Every election that went against the Court the King imputed to the fault of those who lost it, and much too frequently, and too publicly, accused the Whigs of negligence; saying, at the same time, that if the Tories had had a quarter of the support from the Government that the Whigs had received from it for twenty years together, they would never have suffered the Crown to be pushed and the Court to be distressed in the manner it now was: and generally added to these declarations, that he could not help saying, for the honour of the Tories, that they were always much firmer united, and

---

[25] I wonder that Lord Hervey could attach so much importance to such a phrase as this, addressed to a *Vice-Chamberlain* by a young princess, not even a sovereign, going abroad for the first time, and anxious to revisit her mamma and sisters. There is abundant proof in these Memoirs that the Princess Royal had no such influence over the King, or even the Queen, as Lord Hervey suggests. On fitter occasions his deprecation of war is forcible and just.

much more industrious and circumspect, than the Whigs.

That the King often dropped things of this kind was no secret to either party, and as it piqued the one it animated the other; hurting the cause of those he espoused, and promoting the interest of those he wished to depress.

Sir Robert Walpole was now in Norfolk, pushing the county election there, which the [Ministerial] Whigs lost by six or seven voices, to the great triumph of the Opposition. After the election was over he stayed some time at Houghton, solacing himself with his mistress, Miss Skerrett, whilst his enemies were working against him at Richmond, and persuading the King and Queen that the majority of the new Parliament would infallibly be chosen against the Court.

Lord Hervey, who was every day and all day at Richmond, saw this working, and found their Majesties staggering; upon which he wrote an anonymous letter to Sir Robert Walpole with only these few words in it, quoted out of a play:—

> "*Whilst in her arms at Capua he lay,*
> *The world fell mouldering from his hand each hour.*"

Sir Robert knew the hand, understood the meaning, and, upon the receipt of this letter, came immediately to Richmond. Lord Hervey, upon his return, told him what he had heard; but that, the King and Queen both talking in the same strain with regard to the neglect and remissness of the Whigs, and the firmness and industry of the Tories, he could not tell from which of them these notions had been communicated to the other,

or who had infused them originally in either. He said, if they came from the King, he guessed my Lord President for their source; if from the Queen, that the Bishops Hare and Sherlock[26] had propagated them; and he was more inclined to think they came this way for two reasons: in the first place, because the King was more likely to receive impressions from the Queen than to make them; and in the next, because he knew what Sherlock said had more weight with her than anything that came from any mouth but Sir Robert's had with the King. Sir Robert said he did not believe it was Sherlock. Lord Hervey told him both Hare and Sherlock had been with her; that Sherlock was a great favourite; hated the Bishop of London, and knew Sir Robert's partiality to him; had himself an eye to Lambeth, and was sensible he had no chance to go there in case of a vacancy if Sir Robert's power could send the other. Sir Robert Walpole, however, persisted in saying he did not think these arrows came out of Sherlock's quiver, and that he could guess the hand that threw them; however, he did not tell whom he suspected, and I believe was in doubt, though he pretended he was not. But he told Lord Hervey that this was ever his fate, and that he never could turn his back for three days that somebody or other did not give it a slap of this kind. And how, indeed, could it ever be otherwise, for, as he was unwilling to employ anybody under him, or let anybody approach the King and Queen who had any understanding, lest they should

[26] Francis Hare, Bishop of Chichester, and Thomas Sherlock, then Bishop of Bangor, but shortly afterwards translated to Salisbury, and subsequently to London.

employ it against him, so, from fear of having dangerous friends, he never had any useful ones, every one of his subalterns being as incapable of defending him as they were of attacking him, and no better able to support than to undermine him?

Many who lost their elections, and particularly the Duke of Dorset, whose eldest son was thrown out in Kent, imputed every miscarriage of the Court candidates to the Excise scheme; but as soon as Sir Robert came back he set everything right, resumed his power, and effaced every impression that had been made either in the mind of the King or Queen to his disadvantage, or in distrust of the new Parliament. The Ministers' list in the election of the Scotch Peers, notwithstanding the efforts made to subvert the Court interest, was carried by the industry and dexterity of Lord Isla by a very great majority; the minority protested against the illegality of the election. The substance of the protest was, that the Minister had sent an agent down with money to corrupt the electors; that the sixteen who were returned were chosen entirely by that undue influence, and consequently had no right to sit.[27]

Lord Isla was the man on whom Sir Robert Walpole depended entirely for the management of all Scotch affairs: a man of parts, quickness, knowledge, temper, dexterity, and judgment — a man of little truth, little honour, little principle, and no attachment

[27] Lord Marchmont was one of the rejected; and a curious passage in a letter from Lord Chesterfield to him on the occasion—suggesting the *bribing* "two or three of the lowest of those venal peers" to *confess that they had received bribes* from the other side—shows that the Opposition was not more scrupulous than the Ministry they censured.—*Chesterfield Cor.*, iii. p. 94.

but to his interest—a pedantic, dirty, shrewd, unbred fellow of a college, with a mean aspect, bred to the sophistry of the civil law, and made a peer, would have been just such a man. His great maxim on which he regulated his whole political conduct with regard to persons was, "so to love that he might hate, and so to hate that he might love:" that is, never so far to confide as not to dare to break, nor ever so far to outrage as to make it impossible to be reconciled. With all his Parliamentary skill and accomplishments, his ungraceful manner of speaking, his prolixity, his disagreeable voice and bad elocution made all he said lose its force; and what everybody would have owned a good dissertation if they had read it, was never an affecting speech when they heard it: it was not animated enough to persuade, nor attended to enough to convince. Sir Robert Walpole, with all the influence he had upon the Queen's opinions of things and inclination to persons, could never make her love Lord Isla; and though she generally measured her favours if not her affection to people according to the public use they were of to the King's affairs, yet Lord Isla's services, great as they were, could never wash out the stains of his former misdemeanours. The Queen had habituated herself to hating him on his having formerly, for a long while together, made his court to Lady Suffolk; Lady Suffolk now hated him as much for having neglected her in order to gain the Queen, which he could never effect. So that his unfortunate situation with both was, being disliked as much by the one for what he was, as by the other for what he had been; the one quite forgetting how much she had once been obliged, and the other

always remembering how much she had been disobliged. The Duke of Argyle was in still a worse situation in her affections than his brother, and for the same reason;[28] for, Sir Robert Walpole not loving his Grace, and wishing to increase the Queen's dislike to him rather than to remove it, it continued without the least abatement; whilst Sir Robert, by perpetually working in Lord Isla's favour, had a little softened her resentment towards him, though he could never quite eradicate it. Lord Isla's behaviour, and the service he did the King in those last Scotch elections, set forth in all its lustre, made the Queen more willing to allow his merit than she had ever been on any other occasion.

The behaviour of these two brothers to one another was the most extraordinary correspondence ever heard of: they had had a private and personal quarrel ten years ago, and from that time to this had been so exasperated against each other, that they had not exchanged one word; yet were always in the same interest and perpetually convened to the same political meetings, and by the means of a Mr. Stewart (who went between them), a Scotch gentleman, an adroit fellow and a common friend to them both, they acted as much in concert as if they had been the most intimate and most cordial friends.

The Duke of Argyle was of great consequence in Scotland, and the interest of the Campbell family kept these two brothers united. His Grace commanded a great many followers in the House of Commons, and, by being often hungry and often fed, was often in and

[28] See *ante*, p. 168.

often out of humour with the Administration. He was haughty, passionate, and peremptory; gallant, and a good officer; with very good parts, and much more reading and knowledge than generally falls to the share of a man educated a soldier and born to so great a title and fortune.[29]

The tumult of the elections being now over, and the King, Queen, and Ministers pretty well satisfied with the complexion of the new-born Parliament, the Court removed for its summer residence to Kensington, and all the conversation of it was turned from domestic to foreign affairs: I shall therefore now give a short account of the transactions of the campaign.

---

[29] See *ante*, p. 245.

CHAPTER XV.

Foreign affairs—War on the Continent—Campaign in Italy—Pretender in the Spanish army—Conquest of Sicily—Historical Account of Sicily—Battles of Parma and Guastalla—War in Germany—Siege of Philipsburg—Siege and surrender of Dantzic—Gallantry of Count Plélo—Flight of King Stanislaus—Policy of Cardinal Fleury and of Sir Robert Walpole—Counteracted by Hatolf and the Hanoverian Interest, and by the Queen—Opinion of the English Ministers—Character of Count Kinski—Peace preserved.

THE Emperor sent into Italy near 50,000 men, the flower of the Imperial troops, under the command of Count Merci, an old brutal, hot-headed German of fourscore, who had lost his sight, and had all the infirmities of age without the experience, and all the heat of youth without the vigour of it.

To the Rhine he sent Prince Eugène with only 22,000 men to oppose 100,000, and to wait there the arrival of the quotas to be furnished by the princes of the empire, who were as slow to send them as he was pressing to demand them. This disposition of affairs made Count Staremberg tell his Imperial Majesty at Vienna that he had sent an army without a general into Italy, and a general without an army to the Rhine. A reflection very well applied, which he borrowed from Suetonius; for when Cæsar was going into Spain to make war there on the Lieutenants of Pompey, and intended upon their reduction to return and follow Pompey into Greece, Suetonius reports Cæsar to have

said, "*Ire se ad exercitum sine duce, et inde reversurum ad ducem sine exercitu:*"—"That he would first go to the army without a general, and would thence return to the general without an army."

The consequence of this disposition of affairs to the Emperor was, that Italy was soon lost: 30,000 Spaniards, commanded by Count Montemar, marched through the Ecclesiastical States to Naples, soon subdued it, and set Don Carlos (who went at the head of them their titular general) on the throne of that kingdom. The Emperor had 12,000 men (as good troops as any in the world) then in Naples; but as they were commanded by Visconti, then Viceroy of Naples, an old timid dotard, who knew little of civil, and nothing of military affairs, these troops were so disposed that no defence was made against the Spaniards that gave any lustre to the wreaths of their triumph.

This ignorant, superannuated coward, taken out of the Cabinet of the Archduchess at Brussels (where he had nothing to do but raise taxes and keep up Austrian formality), and set at the head of this Government in this difficult conjuncture, knew not which way to turn, or what measures to take; and, instead of collecting his forces to make any stand against the first invasion of the Spaniards, he shut up 4000 men in Gaeta, 4000 more in Capua, and with the other 4000 deserted Naples, and ran he knew not whither up into the country towards Apulia, with what effects of his own he could carry off, leaving his master's affairs to take care of themselves.

By these means about 17,000 Spaniards, very bad troops, who advanced before the rest, and might easily have been defeated by the Imperialists led on by an able general, took possession of Naples, and there crowned Don Carlos without striking a blow; they then pursued the Viceroy, who narrowly escaped himself by the mountains, whilst every man of his miserable little army was either killed or taken prisoner.

This battle [*25th May*] was called the Battle of Bitonto; and the Count Montemar, in consequence of this and all his other services, was created Duke of Bitonto by Don Carlos as soon as ever Don Carlos was crowned King of Naples. Gaeta and Capua were soon after besieged and taken, which left the new King of Naples in absolute and quiet possession of the whole kingdom, save only two or three little inconsiderable places, very improperly called forts, which were soon after reduced. The son of the Pretender was sent a volunteer to the siege of Gaeta in great state, and received with great honours and distinctions by Don Carlos: his retinue consisted of a governor, a master of the horse, four gentlemen of the bedchamber, and inferior domestics in proportion. Gratitude from princes nobody expects—at least who knows them; it was therefore (in that light merely considered) no wonder to see Don Carlos making those troops which the King of England's fleet had brought two years before into Italy treat the pretended heir to his crown as if he had been the true one; but what the policy of the counsels of Spain could be in permitting this step is inconceivable.

As soon as Mr. Keene, the English Minister at the

Court of Spain, heard of this proceeding, he complained of it to Patinho,[1] and said, though he had received no orders yet from England to mention it, he did not believe it would be well taken. Patinho immediately, as first Minister, told Mr. Keene that his Court would absolutely disavow the measure: he declared in the name of his master that no offence was meant to be given to the King of England, and that, since Mr. Keene thought offence would be taken at it, he would immediately despatch a courier to Naples (which accordingly he did) to order the Pretender's son to be sent back. At the same time, Patinho told Mr. Keene that in a private character he would own to him exactly the manner in which this thing had come about. The Duke of Liria, he said, [second] son to the Duke of Berwick, who was cousin-german to this boy,[2] had, when in Don Carlos's army, asked leave of the Court of Spain to bring his cousin there a volunteer, and the Court of Spain, not thinking it an affair of any consequence, had obliged the Duke of Liria in this request; but that, for receiving the boy as Prince of Wales, or paying him any honours as a king's son, he was sure no such thing had been done.

Nevertheless, it was currently reported and generally believed to be otherwise, and that the boy had been received by Don Carlos with all the honours and distinctions that could be showed to him. Particulars too were told that confirmed people in this opinion,

---

1 Don Joseph Patinho, prime minister of Spain.

2 Charles Edward, the young Pretender, was born on the last day of 1720, and was therefore really no more than a *boy*.

especially one, which was, that Don Carlos and this boy coming back together to Naples in a galley from Gaeta, the hat of the young Pretender fell into the sea, and, the mariners going to take it up, Don Carlos cried out, "It is no matter, it floats towards England, and the owner will soon go fetch it; and, that I may have something to fetch too, mine shall accompany it." Upon that he threw his own hat into the sea, whilst the whole retinue of both Princes set up a huzza, all threw their hats into the sea, and cried "*Al Inghilterra! al Inghilterra!*"

Montijo, at London, took the same turn that Patinho did at Madrid; he absolutely denied that Spain had countenanced this measure, and said to the Duke of Newcastle that orders were sent, as soon as the thing was known, to have the boy recalled.

However, this excuse in reality was a very insufficient recompense, the affront having been public and the reparation private.

The King and Queen too were both extremely hurt at it; but Sir Robert Walpole very wisely told them there was no medium to be held in their conduct, and they must either seem quite satisfied with the apology made for the affront, or must thoroughly resent it, and forbid Montijo the Court. He said their Majesties' situation was such, that, if they had a mind to quarrel with Spain, this incident no doubt gave them a handle to do it; but if they had no mind to it, he thought the excuse that had been made for the impertinence of Spain was sufficient to justify their honour in overlooking it: the latter was the part they took.

After the reduction of the kingdom of Naples the

resolution was taken by the Spaniards of making an immediate descent upon Sicily: accordingly an army of **,000 foot and 2000 horse, under the command of the Duke of * * [3], with a fleet of 30 sail, was sent to make that conquest. They soon completed it, the three towns of Messina, Trapani, and Syracuse, which held out longer than the rest, only excepted.[4]

And here I cannot help remarking that this unhappy island seems from the beginning of its existence, at least from the earliest accounts that history unmixed with fable affords us of its fortune, to have been marked out by Heaven as an object of successive calamities. And even those things which are called blessings to other countries have proved such curses to this that they have contributed chiefly to sharpen and promote the series of its misfortunes. I mean by these commonly esteemed blessings the apt situation of Sicily for trade; the fertility of her fields, than which, says Justin, "*nulla terra feracior fuit*—there was no more fruitful soil;" the plenteousness of her harvests, her vineyards, and her olive-trees; the strength of her cities, and the opulence of her people—all which have constantly drawn the eyes of her neighbours upon her, excited their envy, and made them turn their arms to so tempting and desirable an acquisition—

"*Populus Romanus, mox quum videret opulentissimam in proximo prædam, quodammodò Italiæ suæ abscissam et quasi*

---

[3] These blanks are caused by defects in the manuscript, but may from the contemporaneous gazettes be filled up with "18,000" foot—and Duke of "*Bitonto*"—who was next year created Duke of Montemar.

[4] Messina fell in February, Syracuse in June, and Trapani soon after.

revulsam, adeò cupiditate ejus exarsit ut quatenùs nec mole jungi nec pontibus posset, armis belloque jungenda et ad continentem suam revocanda bello videretur."—"The Roman people seeing so rich a prey so near at hand, which had been cut off, and, as it were, torn away from their own Italy, were inflamed with such a desire of possessing it, that, as it could not be reunited by moles or bridges, they were resolved to restore it to the continent by arms and war." (*Florus.*)

"*Hujus ob discordias perpetuas potentiorum injuriis exposita pulchritudo invitavit.*"—"The beauty of the island invited, while the perpetual discords of the native powers exposed it to attack." (*Livy.*)

Whenever Sicily was under a democratic government, intestine violence, jarring factions, popular tumults, and civil contests disturbed her peace, laid waste her plains, destroyed her cities, and thinned her inhabitants with a rage equal to that of foreign wars, and produced events not less fatal than those consequential to the entrance of a conquering external foe. Whenever Sicily has been a province to other states, it has proved the common fate of all other provinces in being drained by the prince and harassed by his vicegerent. When every great city of the island had a prince of its own, or when the greatest part of the island was under the dominion of one king, the government was especially grievous, oppressive, and cruel; whilst such a numerous succession of these royal spoilers was inflicted on this miserable country, that the name of a Sicilian king has been made proverbial to this day. "*Sicuti per annos sane multos externa simul ac civilia bella, et nocentius utrisque malum, tyrannidem passi :*"—"The Sicilians had suffered for many years both ex-

ternal and civil war, and an evil worse than either—a tyrannical government." (*Livy.*)

A tyrant originally meant nothing more than an absolute ruler; but absolute rule being so apt to deviate into oppression, the title of Tyrant, which was at first only synonymous to King, by the general conduct of kings became at last synonymous to an oppressor. The little verbal distinctions between absolute, arbitrary, and destructive sway were lost in practice—they were one and the same thing; and for this reason the name of Tyrant, or τυραννος, was not more feared or detested by the Greeks than that of King or Rex was by the Romans. Among the last, even those men who, in the height of the Roman grandeur and the decline of Roman virtue, usurped the most unlimited power, avoided still the odium of calling themselves by that hateful and detested name, but, sheltering themselves under the less formidable titles of Emperor and Prince of the Senate, and vested with the authority of the Tribunitian power, less obnoxious than that of regal sway, they failed not, under another denomination of government, to act all those injustices which the people, ever more intent on names than things, would not perhaps have borne had they been inflicted by a magistrate under a different appellation. The accounts we have of this island prolong the hardships of foreign invasion and dominion till the descent made there by the Carthaginians a little before the time of expulsion of the kings out of Rome.

Xerxes, when he meditated the conquest of all Greece, fomented these wars of the Carthaginians in Sicily in order to draw forces out of Greece to main-

tain what the Greeks there possessed, and of course to leave Greece itself more exposed to the irruptions he designed there.

Three years the Carthaginians spent in preparations for this descent on Sicily, and then attacked it with an army of 300,000 men and 2000 ships of war. How the address and bravery of Gelon, Tyrant of Syracuse, saved Sicily from ruin by the destruction of this vast Carthaginian fleet and army everybody knows, and that the Carthaginians and Xerxes, who had entered into this mutual alliance in order to make the conquest of all Sicily for the first and all Greece for the last, were both defeated on the same day, the one near Palermo, the other at Thermopylæ, by the memorable sacrifice of 300 Spartans. Sicily after this became the theatre of a fierce and bloody contest between the Athenians and Lacedemonians, the last sending succours to the Syracusians to defend them against the assaults of the first. "*Totius Græciæ bellum in Siciliam translatum erat*:"—"The whole war was transferred from Greece to Sicily." (*Justin.*)

The Carthaginians under the first Hannibal amply revenged the destruction they had suffered from the hand of Gelon; they made a new descent on Sicily, and with innumerable unspeakable cruelties destroyed and dismantled many of their cities, and put all the inhabitants to the sword.

Peace was then made with the Carthaginians by Dionysius the Elder, but it was short, and only made in order to prepare for the long and sanguine war that soon followed.

Immense were the sufferings of Sicily during this war,

as well from their own kings as from their enemies, but particularly after the accession of the Tyrant Dionysius the Younger, who, in the alternate fortunes of sovereignty, banishment, restoration, and re-exile, was equally fatal to this distressed country (see Diod. Sic., b. xvi.); for at that time Icetas, Tyrant of the Leontines, and Timoleon, General of the Corinthians (both called in to assist the two different factions then in Sicily), together with the Carthaginians (who hoped to make advantage of these divisions), were all three afflicting and rending this miserable island at once.

Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, made a descent into Sicily, and in the space of one year or little more won it and lost it.

"*Siculi tradentes Pyrrho totius insulæ imperium quæ assidiis Carthaginiensium bellis vexabatur:*"—"The Sicilians gave up to Pyrrhus the entire dominion of the island, which was so worried by the constant wars of the Carthaginians." (*Justin.*)

"*Pyrrho in Siciliâ omnia sibi prona reperiente:*"—"Pyrrhus finding that everything in Sicily was favourable to him." (*Livy.*)

"*Pyrrhus maxima Siculorum alacritate exceptus est oppida, agros, pecunias, naves, certatim tradentium:*"—"Pyrrhus was received with the greatest alacrity by the Sicilians, who vied with each other in surrendering towns, lands, money, and ships." (*Livy.*)

"*Pyrrhus imperium tam cito amisit quam acquisierat:*"—"Pyrrhus lost the country as rapidly as he had acquired it." (*Justin.*)

His arrival and his departure were both marked with those traces of slaughter and devastation that always attend such sudden revolutions in a country where the prize contested for is so valuable and the contesting parties so powerful. That such causes con-

stantly produce such effects was, in all probability, the opinion of Pyrrhus himself when upon quitting Sicily he said to his courtiers—"*O, amici, qualem Romanis et Carthaginiensibus palæstram relinquimus!*"—"Oh, my friends, what a fine field for combat do we abandon to the Romans and Carthaginians!" (*Livy.*) "*Affectabat enim ut Pœnus, ita Romanus Siciliam; et eodem tempore, paribus uterque votis ac viribus, imperium orbis agitabat:*"—"The Romans and the Carthaginians equally coveted Sicily, and at the same time with the same object and equal forces then contended for the empire of the world." (*Florus.*)

Pyrrhus's prophecy was quickly verified: "*Quod presagium paulo post longa inter hos bella tot utrimque submersæ classes tot acies cæsæ satis superque impleverunt:*"—"Which prophecy the long wars that soon followed, with such a destruction of fleets and such a slaughter of armies, sufficiently, and more than sufficiently, fulfilled." (*Livy.*) Sicily was not only the first, but the fiercest theatre of that deplorable war between the Romans and Carthaginians which lasted so many years, and was pursued with a vigour equal to the incitement, which was nothing less than an universal dominion of what was then, though unjustly, called the world.

For this great prize Sicily was made the first stage of combat, and suffered all those misfortunes which two of the greatest, the bravest, the most potent, and most * * of nations of any age in alternate conquests must necessarily inflict on that country that most immediately feels the fluctuations of such power.

At length the Romans became sole masters of this island, and were the first masters that ever possessed it

entire. What the fertility of its harvests must have been is easy to conceive, when it was called in the most flourishing time of the empire "*Romæ Granarium*"—"the granary of Rome."

To the Romans it long continued a province, taxed, squeezed, impoverished, oppressed, exhausted.

On the declension of the Roman empire in the year 739 and the reign of Theodosius the Younger, Sicily was subdued and ravaged by that great conqueror Genseric, King of the Spanish Vandals. Under the dominion of these barbarians Sicily groaned for near a hundred years; after which space it was in the time of the Emperor Justinian reconquered by his renowned General, Belisarius.

In the year 827 the Saracens got possession of Sicily, established themselves there, and maintained the government of the island, at least of Palermo, for above two hundred years under their *Emirs*.

The Saracens were driven out by the Normans under the command of the two brothers Robert and Roger Guischard: the last of these, called Roger the Humpbacked, made himself absolute master of Sicily, and took the title of Earl. In the person of his son,[5] who succeeded him, and was for his tyranny, avarice, and cruelties called William the Bad, the ancient spirit of a Dionysius or an Agathocles seemed to revive, as if cruelty and oppression always attached to the regal dignity, and that their governor was always to be their oppressor, and their guardian their destroyer.

[5] This is an error: William was son of Roger II., King of Sicily, who himself was grandson of Roger I.

On the death of William, the son of this King, this island, for want of a legitimate son to that Prince, was plunged again into all the calamities and horrors of civil contests. Tancred the Bastard usurped the throne, and after a short disturbed reign of three years resigned his crown with his life, leaving a son, who, after having had his eyes put out, died in prison.

To these troubles soon after succeeded those occasioned by Manfred, natural son to the Emperor Frederic II., which Frederic, in right of his mother, Constance, daughter of William the Bad of Sicily and wife to the Emperor Henry VI., died in possession of this island.

Manfred smothered his father, the Emperor Frederic, with a pillow, and poisoned his brother Conrad, who was the legitimate son of Frederic, and in possession of Sicily—exploits that showed he had qualities which, in case he made himself master of Sicily, would prevent him deviating from the character of a true Sicilian King. Under the pretence of making himself tutor to Conradinus, the son of Conrad, he usurped the government, and after a reign of eleven years, almost as troublesome to himself as to his subjects, he was slain in battle, after having been excommunicated by Pope Urban IV., who was the occasion of his overthrow by calling in Charles of Anjou to depose him, which Charles, in prejudice of Conradin, the true heir, was by the Pope invested with the sovereignty of Naples and Sicily.

The daughter of the bastard and usurper Manfred, being married to Peter III. of Arragon, entailed on

Sicily the disputes and misfortunes which her father had opened there; for by this pretended right to Sicily, conveyed through Constance, daughter of Manfred, to the Princes of Arragon, the successors of Charles of Anjou were in perpetual war with the Arragonians, till, in the year 1282, the Sicilians acted that bloody tragedy called the Sicilian Vespers, in which every Frenchman in the island was massacred in one night. After this massacre the possession of the island fell into the hands of the Spaniards, who from that time to the Treaty of Utrecht governed it by viceroys. At the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713 it was given with the title of King to the Duke of Savoy, who was crowned at Palermo, but kept the possession of Sicily only five years. Philip V., the present King of Spain, who had yielded this island with reluctance by treaty, tried in the year 1718 to regain it by force. How he was prevented from making himself master of it by the English fleet, and why and how it was given to the Emperor, is already related in these papers.

The Germans from that time to this have behaved themselves there with that insolence, brutality, and avarice, so natural to a proud fierce people, that the Sicilians were not sorry to try again their old masters the Spaniards, bad as they were; and at this moment in which I am now writing Sicily is again the cause and seat of war between the Germans and Spaniards, the one trying to maintain the possession of the island, the other to acquire it.

The rapaciousness and cruelty of all these successive plunderers and tyrants made Sicily miserably sensible that in all the changes of her masters she was never to

taste any change in her adversity; and, whatever rotation there was in the fortunes of her oppressors, that there never was to be any in the fate of those they oppressed. Carthaginians, Romans, Vandals, Saracens, French, Spaniards, and Germans, united in demonstrating this melancholy truth; and, how different soever they were in other respects, in this particular at least they all resembled one another.

But to return from the history of the many misfortunes of Sicily to that of the present misfortunes of the Emperor, I must come to relate that his Imperial Majesty's affairs were not under much better management, and met with little better success, in the upper part of Italy than they did in the lower.

The blindness, the infirmity, and incapacity of Count Merci had made the Court of Vienna determine to recall him, and send Count Konigseg in his stead; but whilst Konigseg was on the road, Merci resolved to strike a stroke that should either make the Court of Vienna ashamed to disgrace him, or by which he would lose his life as well as his command. In short, he called a council of war, and determined, against the opinion and remonstrances of all the general officers, to give battle to the army of the allies. Prince Louis of Wirtemberg, cousin to the Queen of England, was the only general officer who did not oppose this undertaking, and he rather acquiesced than approved. He had had a long quarrel with Merci ever since his arrival in Italy, was but just reconciled to him, and for fear of being thought desirous, or at least too ready, to open again that new-healed wound, he rather avoided opposition than gave his assent. When others, who were

not in the same difficulties of opposing as the Prince of Wirtemberg, remonstrated against the weakness of this attempt, enumerated the dangers that must attend such an undertaking, and told Merci it was running his head against a wall, Merci's answer was, "*J'aimerais mieux avoir dix livres de plomb à la tête, qu'une livre de chagrin au cœur*:"—"I had rather have ten pounds of lead in my head than one pound of sorrow at my heart." When they urged the profusion of blood and waste of lives that this measure would make, he said, "Generals were accountable for their courage and for their fidelity, but not for blood or lives."

When the King told this particular to Lord Hervey, he owned it was very true that the Emperor never looked upon the loss of private soldiers as anything. Lord Hervey said it was well for mankind that the Emperor's way of reasoning was not more general; and that for his part there was not anybody he had not rather be than a prince capable of thinking in that manner, except it was one of his subjects; nor could he comprehend this way of reasoning, which was no more justifiable in point of policy than it was reconcilable with humanity, since in his opinion a king could no more look upon any who lavished the lives of his subjects as fit for a general, than he could esteem one who squandered his revenue proper for a treasurer.

This battle was fought [29*th June*] under the walls of Parma, and from Parma received its name.

Merci made a short speech to his troops before he gave the word to charge, and concluded it with telling them—"*Il faut dîner en Parme ou souper en Paradis.*" He promises them, too, in case of victory, the plunder

of Parma for three days. A man who never read the particular account of a battle without being tired of it must be so improper an author to relate one, that I shall say nothing more of this than that it began at nine in the morning and lasted till it was dark; that it was fought across a narrow canal with great fury and great slaughter on both sides; and that the army of the allies was reckoned to have gained a complete victory, though they had no other advantage from it than the remaining masters of the field of battle. The loss of the allies was computed to be about 7000 men and 700 officers; that of the Germans about the same number, with the death of their General, Count Merci, who ordered himself to be carried into the thickest ranks and where the engagement was hottest, and seemed to have no other design in giving this order than gracing his exit with the slaughter of those whose lives had been committed to his care.

The disordered, precipitate retreat of the Imperialists after the battle made their defeat deserve that name more than the number of men they lost. They left all the wounded as well as the dead upon the field of battle, and crossed four rivers in their haste to run from the enemy before they stopped, and left [1200] men behind them in Guastalla, who were all made prisoners of war in a few days after. The leaving the wounded on the spot to take care of themselves, it seems, is the common humane manner of the Austrians in victory as well as in defeat; and the compassionate, just reason they give for it is, the bad economy there would be in giving more money to cure a sick man than is necessary to buy a well one.

The army of the allies was commanded in this action by Monsieur de Coigny, and under him Monsieur de Broglio—the same who was formerly Ambassador from France at the Court of England. Both these Generals had been just made Marshals of France upon the death of Marshal Villars, who, upon a constant misunderstanding and perpetual squabbles with the King of Sardinia, had been recalled from his command of the army, and died on his return home at Turin. He died [21*st June*, *æt.* 83] sole Marshal of France, the Duke of Berwick having been killed a few days before in the trenches at the siege of Philipsburg. When the news of the Duke of Berwick's death by a cannon-ball was brought to Marshal Villars (then dying a lingering death of fever, chagrin, and of a bloody flux), he said—"*Monsieur de Berwick étoit toujours heureux: il l'est autant dans sa mort qu'il l'étoit dans sa vie.*"

Though public rejoicings were ordered throughout all France for this victory in Italy, yet it cost the lives of so many people of condition that half Paris at this season was in private mourning; all the old women weeping their husbands or their sons, and all the young ones a father, a lover, or a brother.

The King of Sardinia was not present at the battle. The Queen, who died a few months after, was then ill at [Turin]. The King, not expecting any immediate action, came thither to make her a visit, and returned to the camp the day after the action. The conduct of Count Merci on this occasion was condemned by everybody except the Emperor, who naturally, one might have imagined, would have condemned it most. But when his Imperial Majesty heard his courtiers censuring his behaviour as rash and

injudicious, he very unexpectedly and roughly cut them short by saying, "*Les morts, Messieurs, ont toujours tort.*"

Monsieur de Konigseg, at his arrival in Italy, found the Imperial army in the most miserable condition, and near 17,000 men wanting to complete the number of which it consisted when the Germans took the field at the beginning of the campaign.

It was remarkable that he found these two armies just in the same situation in which they had been in 1703, when he served under Marshal Staremberg, and the Duke of Vendôme commanded the French, who were then, as now, just going to besiege Mirandola. Not long after Monsieur de Konigseg took the command of the Imperial army, the Germans again gave battle to the allies. The army of the allies was encamped in two separate bodies, and on different sides of a small river called the Sechia: that body of troops which was encamped the nearest to the Imperial army consisted of [25 or 30] battalions under the command of Marshal Broglio, whom Monsieur de Konigseg one night [14*th Sept.*] surprised in his quarters and entirely defeated, killing many of his men, taking many prisoners, and putting the rest to the most confused flight. Their whole baggage, amounting to a great value, was the booty of the German soldiers, who, like the rest of their countrymen, never slip any occasion to lay hold of any seizable half-crown. This was, as some think, the occasion of the army of the allies not being entirely routed; for many were of opinion that, had the Imperialists, immediately after this action, attacked the other part of the camp of the allies whilst the great consternation spread throughout the troops by this

blow was fresh and unrecovered, they might have safely cut off the whole of the enemy; but that, whilst the German soldiers were plundering, and the Austrian General deliberating, three days elapsed, and the attack was made [19*th Sept.*] too late on a recovered and entrenched enemy. This battle, called the Battle of Guastalla, was fought with great bravery and great slaughter on both sides. In these two actions, between which there was, as I have said, only the space of three days, many officers of distinction were killed in both armies, and about 8000 men on each side.

The Marshal Broglio's disgrace for having been surprised in his quarters, and losing, for want of common guard and watch, all the men committed to his care, was not only the subject of every Gazette in Europe, but the topic of every conversation, and the burden of ten thousand ballads that were sung in all Paris and all France to ridicule his negligent conduct and his extraordinary flight, which was made in his shirt upon a cart-horse, his breeches in his hand, and his two sons riding before him. He was fast asleep when a sentinel at the door of his tent first came in to tell him the Germans were in his camp; and he had just time to make his escape in the manner which I have described. It was said, that, whilst he was in the stable in his shirt bridling his cart-horse, he was seized as a prisoner by one of the German soldiers, who knew him not, nor in the least imagined this prize to be a Marshal of France. The Marshal told the German trooper he was an undercook in Monsieur de Broglio's kitchen, not worth his care, and begged his release; upon which the trooper gave him a kick and let him go.

The Marshal de Broglio's situation on this occasion was just that of Cerialis, thus described by Tacitus:—"*Dux semisomnus, ac prope intectus, errore hostium servatur, et quamquam periculum captivitatis evasisset, infamiam non vitavit:*"—"The General, half asleep and almost naked, was saved by a mistake of the enemy; but though he avoided the danger of being taken prisoner, he did not escape the infamy of his own negligence."

Thus went affairs in Italy. I must now go back to the opening of the campaign on the Rhine, when Marshal Berwick divided his army, which consisted of above 100,000 men, into two bodies, with one of which he besieged Philipsburg, and with the other (which was strongly entrenched) he covered the besieging army.

As soon as the auxiliaries joined Prince Eugène, the first of which were 6000 Hanoverians, he marched towards Philipsburg with his whole army, which now, with the Hanoverians, the Danes, the Prussians, the Suabians, the Franconians, and other quotas furnished by the Princes and *Circles* of the Empire, amounted nominally to about fourscore thousand men. Both armies continued for some weeks within musket-shot of each other, during which time all Europe expected every day to hear they were engaged in a general battle, and the whole world seemed to agree it was impossible they should separate without an action—whoever moved first running the risk of being cut in pieces. When Marshal Berwick's head was shot off by a random shot in the trenches, it was concluded that Prince Eugène would take advantage of the consternation

which the loss of a general always occasions in an army to attack the French camp; but whether he found it too strongly entrenched to venture such an undertaking, or thought the Emperor's affairs in such a situation that hazarding a battle at the gate of Germany was playing too deep, I know not. Whatever his motive was, it is certain he remained in inaction, and had the mortification of being forced to suffer Philipsburg to be taken in his sight, though he had promised the Governor to relieve him.

I know the French did not expect to have carried their point with so little resistance, Monsieur Chavigny, a little before the town surrendered, having shown me a letter from Monsieur de Belleisle (who formerly commanded at the siege of Strasburg), in which I remember these words,—"*Une mollesse surprenante règne par tout dans les troupes Impériales, mais nous ne pouvons pas espérer que cette mollesse puisse se repandre à un tel point que Monsieur le Prince Eugène nous verra prendre Philipsbourg, les bras croisés.*"

On the death of the Duke of Berwick, Monsieur d'Asfeldt and Monsieur de Noailles were created Marshals of France, and the principal command of the army on the Rhine (where they both were) was given to the former.

Monsieur Witgenau, Governor of Philipsburg, behaved extremely well, but the garrison infamously ill, there being near 4000 men in the place, with ammunition and provisions sufficient to have held out a month longer, when the garrison obliged the Governor to surrender [18*th July*], and refused to strike another stroke to defend the town, though the walls of the main body

of the place were still entire, and nothing but the horn and crown works and out-fortifications yet taken.

The besiegers were so much inconvenienced by the overflowings of the Rhine, so afflicted by sickness, and so distressed by the scarcity of provisions, that the French said, notwithstanding the fortitude and resolution with which the troops behaved, in case the town had held out a week longer, they must have raised the siege.

When the Prince of Conti complimented the Governor after the capitulation, as he was marching out of the town, upon the brave defence he had made, the Governor said, with great civility to his enemies and great indignation against his own men, that, had he had Frenchmen to command, the town had been yet untaken.

The night the news came to England that Philipsburg was taken, the Princess Royal, as Lord Hervey was leading her to her own apartment after the drawing-room, shrugged up her shoulders and said, "Was there ever anything so unaccountable as the temper of papa? He has been snapping and snubbing every mortal for this week, because he began to think Philipsburg would be taken; and this very day that he hears it actually is taken he is in as good humour as ever I saw him in my life. *Mais, pour vous dire la vérité, je trouve cela si bizarre, et (entre nous) si sot, que j'enrage de sa bonne humeur encore plus que je ne faisois de sa mauvaise.*" "Perhaps," answered Lord Hervey, "he may be about Philipsburg as David was about the child, who, whilst it was sick, fasted, lay upon the earth, and covered himself with ashes; but, the

moment it was dead, got up, shaved his beard, and drank wine." "*It may be like David*" (replied the Princess Royal), "*but I am sure it is not like Solomon.*"

It was reported at this time that the Emperor, notwithstanding all the disadvantages under which Prince Eugène must have forced the French to an engagement before Philipsburg, blamed him for not doing it; there being at that time a strong faction against Prince Eugène at Vienna, and this being the way of reasoning with which they had possessed the Emperor:—That in case the Imperialists could beat the French, they might march into France and do what they pleased; and in case they were beaten, that the maritime powers, who as yet remained neuter, would be obliged to take part in his quarrel. In Prince Eugène's camp there were, besides several other great princes, the King of Prussia, his eldest son, and the Prince of Orange. When the last went thither the Princess Royal returned [*29th June*] to England.

After the surrender of Philipsburg, the French and the Imperialists, notwithstanding the impossibility insisted on by all mankind of their parting without blows, separated very quietly by a mutual retreat: so easy is it in any situation for two great armies to find means either to fight or let it alone, when each antagonist wills the same thing. The sickness that raged in the French camp, and the fatigue the troops had undergone during the siege, made them in all probability ready enough to decline a general battle; and their army being able, besides the strength of their entrenchments before, to fortify themselves now behind, by retiring under the cannon of Philipsburg,

made the disadvantage on which Prince Eugène must have attacked them too great for him to undertake it. The same policy too that made the Court of Vienna desire a battle might perhaps induce the Court of France to avoid it; the latter fearing perhaps as much as the first wished to bring things to such an extremity as should oblige England and Holland to take part in this squabble, farther than by their pacific good offices to compose it.

Nor was it wonderful that Prince Eugène should be slow to take any hints given him from his Court to pursue more violent and more hazardous measures; since nothing could be more natural than for a man of his age and character to fear bringing the one into disgrace, and throwing any shade over the lustre of the other.[6]

Whilst these things were doing on the Rhine, I must now relate how matters were carried on in the North. King Stanislaus, with the Primate, and Monti, the French ambassador, were retired to Dantzic, received by the magistrates of that place, and shut up there by the Russians, who, after burning, pillaging, and laying waste every town and field in Poland, marched to Dantzic under the command of their General, Count Munich, summoned the Dantzicers to surrender the town and give up Stanislaus, and, upon their refusal, formed the siege of that place.

The Dantzicers, having taken money from France to

[6] Prince Eugène was now seventy-one, and the historians quote this affair of Philipsburg as a proof that he had no longer the energy and activity necessary for command. They add (which indeed is saying the same thing in other words) that he was afraid of risking his former reputation.

receive Stanislaus, and expecting succours from thence every hour to relieve them, stood the siege with great firmness, bravery, and resolution — the attack was formed, and the defence made, with equal vigour on both sides.

The Elector of Saxony, in the mean time, choosing, whilst the Muscovites marched to Dantzic, rather to be fought for than to fight, took a short turn, and to the astonishment of all Europe, left the Russian army just at this juncture, and went to Dresden to settle the affairs of his electorate, which, as he pretended, required his immediate presence.

This happening to be the season too for the fair of Leipsic, and his presence being equally necessary there, his Electoral Highness took this opportunity to go and partake of those recreations, and, whilst the Russians were cannonading and bombarding Dantzic in his cause, he was diverting himself with seeing harlequinades and rope-dancers, and buying snuff-boxes and toothpick-cases for the Polish ladies at the fair. By which means, the worthy cause of all this strife, who had first, like a fool, drawn himself into this quarrel when he should have kept out of it, now, like a coward, drew himself out of it when he ought to have kept in it, and acted as much contrary to his honour in not endeavouring, when he was embarked, to maintain the crown of Poland, as he had acted contrary to his interest in ever attempting to acquire it.

When one sees the blood of brave and honest fellows shed, and hears of the lives of thousands devoted to the foolish glory and mistaken interest of such princely idols, even in this enlightened age of the world, how

can one be surprised if superstition and bigotry in the earlier and darker ages of it could induce Egyptian fathers to sacrifice their sons to onions and monkeys? or how can one have a greater reverence for those who are so stupidly loyal than for those who were so ignorantly pious?

I cannot here pass over in silence a very gallant action of Count Plélo,[7] a man bred in camps, but now ambassador from France at the Court of Denmark. A miserable little succour of about 1800 men was sent by France to throw themselves, if they could, into Dantzic; they attempted it, were repulsed, and, as Count Plélo thought, with too little resistance; he therefore undertook to rally them, put himself at their head, and marched first, showed them the way to the only open entrance into the town, and endeavoured to animate them by words as well as example. But whilst he was exciting them to face and brave the dangers that opposed this attempt of entering the town, by perpetually crying out "*Avancez! avancez!*" he was slain by several wounds, which it is generally thought he received not from the enemy, but from his own followers, who were instigated, as it was conjectured, to this infamous act by some of their superiors, who had been piqued at the reproaches of Count Plélo, and grudged him the chance of gaining that reputation in renewing this attempt, which they had lost by giving it up.

When the King of England related this history of

[7] Louis Hyppolite de Brehan, Count de Plélo, a gentleman of Brittany, though "bred in camps," had already attained a certain distinction in literature by some astronomical tracts, and by some light poetry. He was killed at the age of thirty-five. The French corps, not being able to make their way into Dantzic, soon after capitulated to the number of 2700.

Count Plélo to his courtiers at Richmond, he said, with tears in his eyes, "It was a brave action; he was a fine fellow. I think a prince is too happy who has such servants." He to whom his Majesty addressed this discourse replied, "I think, Sir, those subjects still more happy who are governed by a prince that deserves such servants." The King loved heroism and flattery both so well, that he seemed almost as much pleased with the answer as with the action.

Soon after this adventure, the fort of Wechselmunde, that commands the mouth of the Vistula, on which Dantzic is situated, being taken by the Muscovites [23*rd June*], all communication with the town from the sea (which was the only communication it had long had) was cut off, and Dantzic at last, after a brave and obstinate defence, was obliged to capitulate [7*th July*].

The night before the chamade was beat, Stanislaus made his escape to Koningsberg in the habit of a peasant, and attended by only one valet de chambre, leaving behind him a letter of thanks to the magistrates for the favours he had received at their hands, and declaring in the most pathetic terms the concern with which he found himself obliged to desert those whom no hardships, no fears, and no threats had been able to prevail with to abandon him.[8]

The conditions on which the Russian General obliged the Dantzicers to surrender were very severe, with regard to the vast sum he forced them to pay towards

[8] There is in the 'Historical Register' for 1736 a long and curious letter from King Stanislaus, giving an account of his very difficult flight and narrow escape.

the expenses of the war (four million rix dollars), and all of them were constrained to acknowledge King Augustus, and to take an oath of allegiance to him as their lawful sovereign.

The Primate alone refused to take the oath, and was for this refusal sent close prisoner to Elbing, and afterwards to Thorn, where he persisted, unterrified by threats and unallured by promises, in constant fidelity to King Stanislaus. His behaviour was great, and his conduct uniform. Monti was also confined with the Primate, contrary, as the French alleged, to the law of nations, and in violation of the sacred title of ambassador. The Russians excused this step by saying that the French had been the aggressors in taking a frigate of theirs without any previous declaration of war; and by Monti's acting in opposition to them.

Whilst the arms of France were thus employed in Italy and on the Rhine, and thus unemployed at Dantzic, there were great murmurs throughout all that kingdom against the Cardinal's conduct, and great fault found with the orders and instructions he had given in every part of the world where France was concerned.

In the first place he was extremely censured for permitting the Spaniards to separate themselves in Italy from the army of the Allies, and suffering them to go and do their own particular business in seating Don Carlos on the throne of Naples before the common cause was served and the Emperor driven out of the upper part of Italy.

In the next place, his instructions to the generals on the Rhine were no better approved than his passive conduct with regard to the separation of the Spaniards

in Italy. Everybody could see and blame the error of not suffering Prince Eugène to be attacked before the auxiliaries joined him, when he had only an army of 22,000 men; and people equally condemned his ordering the useless siege of Philipsburg to be undertaken, instead of this stroke, which, as the French said, would have put them into a condition of making what irruptions they pleased into the empire, or of putting an honourable and immediate end to the war, and making peace with the Emperor on what terms they thought fit.

The Cardinal was likewise reproached with giving up the honour of France in the most essential point by sending no succours to Dantzic. There was nobody in Paris who did not descant on the infamy it brought upon the King to suffer his father-in-law to be so abandoned and exposed; and how little justice or gratitude there was, in permitting those who had so hospitably received and so bravely defended him to be given up to the resentment of the common enemy. They further added, that France must rather incur ridicule than acquire glory by sending her forces, like so many Don Quixotes, to make conquests and gain kingdoms for other princes, whilst the father of their own Queen was hunted out of his; and the chief cause of the war so ill prosecuted and maintained, that the only point France pretended originally to have in view, or in which she was really concerned, was given up and carried against her.

The Cardinal excused himself, with regard to Italy, by saying he had protested against the separation of the Spaniards, but had not been able to prevent it.

The Queen of Spain was so bent on that expedition for her son, that his Eminence said there was no middle way for him to take; he was obliged either to consent to the attack of Naples, or to dissolve the triple alliance. As to the neglect of giving battle to Prince Eugène when he was at the head of only 22,000 men, the Cardinal said he had never desired to push this war to extremities, nor to do anything that should look as if the ruin of the empire, or enlarging the dominions of France, was designed; all he desired was to humble the pride of the Court of Vienna and the House of Austria, and to do justice to the insulted honour of his master in maintaining the rights of the King his father-in-law.

This made people say that the scheme of his Eminence then was to put France to the expense of armies without allowing them the liberty to fight; and that, according to this way of reasoning, he was so pacifically and charitably inclined, that he was as much afraid of hurting his enemies as his friends, and more apprehensive of giving too much annoyance to the first than procuring too little benefit to the last.

But most people imagined the Cardinal's reason at this time for acting as he did was (as I have already mentioned) the fear of bearing so hard on the Emperor as might alarm England and Holland, and induce those two powers, who were now mediators for peace, to make themselves parties in the war. It was certainly no oversight in the French councils that prevented Prince Eugène being attacked; the Duke of Berwick having made the proposal to the Cardinal, and the Cardinal, at the same time that he rejected it,

making a merit to the ministers of England and Holland of his moderation in so doing.

But that which was most of all cried out against was the sending no succours to Dantzic; and as the Cardinal in his justification could not publicly give the real reasons for this seeming negligence and dishonourable omission, he was forced to stand all the irksome reproach of it in a patient and passive silence.

The true state of this case, I believe, was, though France had at this time a fleet of about ninety sail riding in the Channel, ready to convey troops to Dantzic, yet, the English lying at the same time in the Downs in sight of the French coasts, the Cardinal did not dare to leave the shores of France naked, for fear the English, who were then offering their mediation to adjust the disputes of Europe, might have taken that opportunity to oblige France to accept of what terms of accommodation they thought proper, by threatening, in case France refused to comply, to make a descent into their country on the west, whilst all their forces were employed in the east and the south, and their fleet sailed into the north.[9]

Some people imagined that Spain had at present so great an influence on the councils of France, that she insisted on the French fleet continuing where it was to

[9] This conjecture is altogether improbable—indeed almost absurd: there was no colour of danger from England; nor was it necessary to have sent ninety sail to convey succours to Dantzic. A better reason would have been, that the holding out of Dantzic would have cost money and lives, without any change in the ultimate result of the contest except, perhaps, a little more discredit; and, after all, 2700 men would have been no inconsiderable reinforcement to a garrison: but Lord Hervey, who had hoped so sanguinely for Stanislaus's success, seems to have been personally piqued at his failure, and to have looked at the whole affair with a prejudiced eye.

keep the English in awe, and prevent our fleet sailing to the Mediterranean; the Spaniards still remembering the year eighteen, when they had then, as now, a design of invading Sicily, and were defeated in that design by the interposition of Lord Torrington. It was said, the Spaniards feared the same game might be played over again, and therefore pressed France to keep this check upon England at home, that England might be none upon them in the Mediterranean.

This I give only as conjecture, for, whether it was the fears of Spain for the success of their intended expedition to Sicily, or the apprehensions of France in leaving their own coasts defenceless, or both combined, that prevented the French fleet from sailing to the relief of Dantzic, was never certainly, or at least publicly and generally, known.

During these transactions abroad, the King was in the utmost anxiety at home. The battles of Bitonto and Parma, the surrender of Philipsburg, and the bad situation of the Emperor's affairs in every quarter, gave his Majesty the utmost solicitude to exert himself in the defence of the House of Austria, and to put some stop to the rapid triumphs of the House of Bourbon. For though the King was ready to allow all the personal faults of the Emperor, and was not without resentment for the treatment he himself had met with from the Court of Vienna, yet his hatred to the French was so strong, and his leaning to an Imperial cause so prevalent, that he could not help wishing to distress the one and support the other, in spite of all inferior, collateral, or personal considerations.

In all occurrences he could not help remembering that,

as Elector of Hanover, he was a part of the Empire, and the Emperor at the head of it; and these prejudices, operating in every consideration where his interest as King of England ought only to have been weighed, gave his Minister, who consulted only the interest of England, perpetual difficulties to surmount, whenever he was persuading his Majesty to adhere solely to that.

The King's love for armies, his contempt for civil affairs, and the great capacity he thought he possessed for military exploits, inclined him still with greater violence to be meddling, and warped him yet more to the side of war. He used almost daily and hourly, during the beginning of this summer, to be telling Sir Robert Walpole with what eagerness he glowed to pull the laurels from the brows of the French generals, to bind his own temples; that it was with the sword alone he desired to keep the balance of Europe; that war and action were his sole pleasures; that age was coming fast upon him; and that, if he lost the opportunity of this bustle, no other occasion possibly might offer in which he should be able to distinguish himself, or gather those glories which were now ready at his hand. He could not bear, he said, the thought of growing old in peace, and rusting in the cabinet, whilst other princes were busied in war and shining in the field; but what provoked him most of all, he confessed, was to reflect that, whilst he was only busied in treaties, letters, and despatches, his booby brother, the brutal and cowardly King of Prussia,[10] should pass his time in camps, and in the midst of arms, neither desirous of the

[10] See *ante*, p. 127.

glory nor fit for the employment; whilst he, who coveted the one and was trained for the other, was, for cold prudential reasons, debarred the pleasure of indulging his inclination, and deprived of the advantage of showing his abilities.

This was the language he perpetually held, and in this manner was he for ever declaiming to Sir Robert Walpole, whilst all private business and domestic affairs were at a full stand, and no answer to be got from him to the solicitation of any person whatsoever. Whenever Sir Robert Walpole, with the business of twenty different people taken down in abridgment upon his paper of notes, went into the King's closet to speak to him on those heads, the King always began to harangue on the military topic, and, after a declamation of about an hour long, dismissed Sir Robert without one of the things settled on which he came prepared to speak, and often without giving him opportunity barely to mention them.[11]

This conduct bore every way hard upon Sir Robert Walpole—in the first place, as it pressed him so close to come into the measure of war, which he was determined to keep out of; and in the next, as it forced him to find repeated excuses to put people off who were every day teazing him for answers to their solicitations; for, as everybody is anxious in their own case, and all imagined that decision depended entirely on Sir Robert's will, so whatever pains they felt from suspense

[11] All the ministers of George II.'s great-grandson, George IV., could bear witness to the adroitness and success with which he so turned conversations as to prevent their entering on any subject disagreeable to him, which, with a wonderful sagacity, he used to foresee.

were placed to his account. The hopes he gave and the promises he made them were looked upon as ministerial arts to palliate delay, and whatever failed or was postponed from his want of power to prevent it was imputed to him as the effect of negligence or insincerity. But the circumstance that gave Sir Robert Walpole the most trouble of all was that with regard to the war he found the Queen as unmanageable and opinionated as the King. There are local prejudices in all people's composition, imbibed from the place of their birth, the seat of their education, and the residence of their youth, that are hardly ever quite eradicated, and operate much stronger than those who are influenced by them are apt to imagine; and the Queen, with all her good sense, was actuated by these prejudices in a degree nothing short of that in which they biassed the King. Wherever the interest of Germany and the honour of the Empire were concerned, her thoughts and reasonings were often as German and Imperial as if England had been out of the question; and there were few inconveniences and dangers to which she would not have exposed this country rather than give occasion to its being said that the Empire suffered affronts unretorted, and the House of Austria injuries unrevenged, whilst she, a German by birth, sat upon this throne an idle spectatress, able to assist and not willing to interpose.

Besides her natural propensity to the interest of Germany, she was constantly plied on this side of the question, and warmed as fast as Sir Robert Walpole cooled her, by one Hatolf, the King's sole minister in England for the affairs of his Electorate—a clear-sighted, artful fellow, who was devoted to the interest

of Germany and the Court of Vienna, and had more weight with the Queen next to Sir Robert than any man that had access to her. He was a man of great temper, and could reason with decency; and yet was full as hard to be either convinced or persuaded as his master.

The Queen, tired of going between this man and Sir Robert Walpole to report and interpret, and not being so much mistress of their arguments in detail, made Monsieur Hatolf put his system of politics and his plan for the conduct of England at this juncture into writing. In this paper, though the substance of it was little better than treating England as a province to the Empire, yet he reasoned so artfully and so conformably to the Queen's sentiments and inclination, gave up the interest of this country so plausibly, and argued so strongly for the Emperor on the foot of preserving the balance of Europe, that Sir Robert Walpole told Lord Hervey he never saw any memorial better drawn, or more dexterously calculated, by improving the Queen's partiality and piquing her pride, to carry the point he was labouring to bring about.

Hatolf set forth in the most formidable colours the growing power of France and the House of Bourbon; he said all the reasons that induced this country to engage in King William's and Queen Anne's war ought to operate much stronger now, as France was more powerful and in better circumstances, and that, this nation having so cheerfully come into those wars, he could not conceive why Sir Robert Walpole should imagine people would reason so differently now. He insisted upon it that without help from England the Empire was absolutely at the mercy of France; and

though the lenity or indolence of the Cardinal had prevented France from the exertion of her power, yet, as the Cardinal was above fourscore years of age, his life was but a bad tenure for the balance of Europe, and that a more active successor would quickly prove how fatally we had neglected to oppose what might then be too strong for us to stop.

This paper, written in French, the Queen gave to Sir Robert Walpole, ordering him to consider it and give her his answer to it in English. Sir Robert Walpole answered it paragraph by paragraph,[12] and in this answer had an opportunity of methodizing, recapitulating, and enforcing every argument he had before made use of either to the King or the Queen to deter them from following their inclination and taking part in this war.

When Sir Robert Walpole gave Lord Hervey an account of these two papers, he said he had at the same time told the Queen that she knew it had been always his opinion ever since this quarrel began in Europe that England ought to have nothing to do with it but to compose it; that if it continued and England took any part in it, her crown would at last as surely come to be fought for[13] as the crown of Poland; and

[12] See in Coxe's Appendix several papers of Sir Robert's own in defence of his policy.

[13] Sir Robert more than once warned George II. that his British crown would be fought for on British ground—a prophecy fulfilled a few months after his death in 1745. Posterity is pretty well agreed in approving the peaceable policy pursued by Walpole, and advocated by Lord Hervey, under the then circumstances; but, on the other hand, it must be admitted that the acquisition of Lorraine by France disturbed the balance of Europe to a degree that Europe never has recovered; and, as a general question, it cannot be doubted that Austria is a natural ally of England, because France has been, and always must be, the most formidable enemy to both.

then bade her judge and determine whether the Emperor in justice or in policy ought to receive that support from her that she seemed so desirous to give him.

Lord Hervey approved of everything Sir Robert had written, but still more of what he had said, and told him his last argument, in his opinion, was much the most likely to prevail; for, notwithstanding her partiality to the Empire, "if I know anything of her Majesty, the shadow of the Pretender will beat the whole Germanic body."

Sir Robert said it was true, and that he had always recourse to that argument whenever he found his others make less impression than he wished. This great minister, besides the interest of England (which I think he had sincerely at heart), was induced by some personal considerations to stick firm to the point of keeping this nation out of the war if possible. In the first place, to avoid the unpopularity of advising war and creating new clamour against his Administration; in the next, he knew the ungrateful task of raising money to support war would all fall to his share; and added to this, I believe he was not without apprehension that more military business might throw the power he now possessed into the hands of military men. Whatever his reasons and motives were, it is certain he was always counsel on the side of peace; and though he pleaded that cause singly against the King, the Queen, and all about them, hitherto he carried his point and kept things quiet. The Duke of Newcastle, who always talked as his master talked, echoed back all the big words his Majesty uttered, and expatiated

for ever on regaining Italy for the Emperor, chastising Spain, and humbling the impertinent pride of France. His Grace's predominant sensation was fear; and though the moment the war had been declared all the difficulties appendent to that measure would have kept him in incessant panics, yet, the fear of contradicting the King being the present fear, and the present fear in all weak minds getting the better of every other, he promoted that from timidity which, had he had foresight sufficient to discern consequences, the same motive would have made him the first to oppose.

The Duke of Grafton, who loved making his court as well as the Duke of Newcastle, talked in the same strain and for the same reasons, but could never make any great compliment to the King and Queen of embracing their opinion, as he never understood things enough to have one of his own to sacrifice, and was rather obliged to them for giving him the appearance of an opinion, when without that assistance he would have been as much at a loss what to say as what to think.

Lord Grantham was a degree still lower, and had the animal gift of reasoning in so small a proportion that his existence was barely distinguished from a vegetable. His Lordship never got further upon this chapter than to declare and often to repeat, in very bad English, "I hate the French, and I hope as we shall beat the French." Mr. Poyntz, Governor to the Duke,[14] a man of learning, of sense, and of reputation,

[14] The Right Honourable Stephen Poyntz had been one of the ministers to the Congress at Soissons.

was another who helped to strengthen her Majesty in this way of thinking; but whether he spoke his opinion or only aimed at making his court I know not—Sir Robert Walpole thought the first, I thought the last.

Lord Harrington, who with all his seeming phlegm was as tenacious of an opinion when his indolence would suffer him to form one as any man living, leaned strongly to the side of war; but his credit at Court ran very low, and little deference was ever paid to his sentiments either by the King or Queen but when they tallied with their own, and in that case their Majesties would sometimes seem to do what I fear is too common with all mankind, which is to flatter ourselves that we show some regard to the judgment of others, when in reality we only pay it to the rebound of our own.

Lord Harrington's understanding had very odd luck in the world, for it was as much underrated after he came to be Secretary of State as it had been overrated before. The public seemed to be stating a sort of account debtor and creditor to his capacity, and to be determined to take from it now in the same proportion that it had added to it formerly. His parts in reality were of the common run of mankind. He was well bred, a man of honour, and fortunate, loved pleasure, and was infinitely lazy. The Queen once in speaking of him said, "There is a heavy insipid sloth in that man that puts me out of all patience. He must have six hours to dress, six more to dine, six more for his mistress, and six more to sleep, and there, for a minister, are the four-and-twenty admirably well disposed of; and if now and then he borrows six of those hours to do anything relating to his office, it is for something

that might be done in six minutes and ought to have been done six days before."

Horace Walpole was, for the reasons I have before mentioned, as much for war as his brother was against it, and was as busy in Holland to make the Dutch act against their interest as he was ready at home to sacrifice ours; but happily for this country he succeeded no better than he judged.

It is no great matter what posterity thinks or says of one, but if it were I would pay less deference to truth and more to my own reputation in the characters I give of people, since no one who did not live in these times will, I dare say, believe but some of those I describe in these papers must have had some hard features and deformities exaggerated and heightened by the malice and ill-nature of the painter who drew them. Others perhaps will say that at least no painter is obliged to draw every wart or wen or hump-back in its full proportion, and that I might have softened these blemishes where I found them. But I am determined to report everything just as it is, or at least just as it appears to me; and those who have a curiosity to see courts and courtiers dissected must bear with the dirt they find in laying open such minds with as little nicety and as much patience as in a dissection of their bodies, if they wanted to see that operation, they must submit to the disgust.

Count Kinski, the Emperor's Ambassador at this Court (who possessed the two Imperial characteristics of dulness and pride in the supreme degree), notwithstanding the distress his master's affairs were in, was as refractory when anything was asked of him, and as

peremptory when he demanded anything of anybody else, as he could have been had the Emperor gained as many victories as he had suffered defeats. The Queen, as he was riding by her chaise one day at a stag-chase, reproached him with this stiffness, and said people when they wanted anything mightily should only think of the means to obtain it. This was said with regard to the haughty and impertinent manner in which the Emperor asked, or rather expected, at this time the assistance of the Dutch. "If a handkerchief lay before me," said the Queen, "and I felt I had a dirty nose, my good Count Kinski, do you think I should beckon the handkerchief to come to me, or stoop to take it up?"

Kinski was at this time so exasperated against Sir Robert Walpole, to whose counsels and power he thought it was owing that the Emperor was unassisted, that he would hardly pay him the common civility of a bow; and every letter that he wrote to Vienna that was intercepted by the Government here was found as full of invectives against Sir Robert Walpole's conduct as any of the '*Craftsmen.*'

The reason of this was that the King, loving to make a figure to others by adopting those things for his own that had been said to him with weight, used to talk of the Emperor's absurd conduct to Kinski in the drawing-room in German, in the very same strain that Sir Robert had talked of it to him in English in the closet; and this being a style so very different from the language the King had held some months ago, Kinski had just sense enough to discern who must have wrought this change, and abused Sir Robert for it as

violently as he hated him. This made Sir Robert odious at Vienna, but it had so little effect here that by the latter end of this summer Sir Robert had brought the King so much into his way of thinking that the King one day said to him, "I have followed your advice, Walpole, in *keeping quiet*, contrary often to my own opinion, and sometimes I have thought contrary even to my honour; but I am convinced you advised me well: the overtures of friendship that are now made to me by every party in this formidable alliance, and the solicitations I receive from all quarters to mediate in the present disputes, show me plainly that hitherto we are right, and I acknowledge it is all entirely owing to your judgment and prudence that we are so."

Whether this was said quite so strongly as I relate it I doubt, it being so very unlike the King's style on other occasions; but I relate it literally as Sir Robert Walpole related it to me.

CHAPTER XVI.

Increased Favour of Lord Hervey—Addresses a Political Letter to the Queen—Mission of M. Wasner—Extraordinary History and Proceedings of Strickland, Bishop of Namur—Lord Hervey's Conference with Sir Robert Walpole—Walpole's Management of the King and Queen—Apology for Egotism—Sir R. Walpole's System of Government.

LORD HERVEY was this summer in greater favour with the Queen, and consequently with the King, than ever; they told him everything, and talked of everything before him. The Queen sent for him every morning as soon as the King went from her, and kept him, while she breakfasted, till the King returned, which was generally an hour and a half at least. By her interest, too, she got the King to add a thousand pounds a-year to his salary, which was a new subject for complaint to the Prince. She gave him a hunter; and on hunting-days he never stirred from her chaise. She called him always her "child, her pupil, and her charge;" used to tell him perpetually that his being so impertinent and daring to contradict her so continually, was owing to his knowing she could not live without him; and often said, "It is well I am so old, or I should be talked of for this creature."[1]

Lord Hervey made prodigious court to her, and really loved and admired her.[2] He gave up his sole

[1] The Queen was fourteen years older than Lord Hervey.

[2] It seems that he *really* did. There are private letters of his, long after her death, that prove the sincerity of his affection and admiration.

time to her disposal; and always told her he devoted it in winter to her business,[3] and in summer to her amusement. But, in the great debate at present on the affairs of Europe, and the part this country ought to act with regard to peace and war, Lord Hervey differed with her Majesty in opinion *toto cœlo*; and, in speaking that opinion to her too freely, often met with very short and very rough answers. One hunting-day, particularly, he found the Queen, after a long dispute on this subject by the side of her chaise, so much dissatisfied with his persisting to combat her opinion, that as soon as he came home he wrote the following paper, and gave it her at night as she rose from play, after having previously insisted on her promising not to show it to anybody whatever:—

"MADAM,

"I CANNOT help beginning this paper with complaining that your Majesty forces me to speak on the topic you introduced this morning on purpose to hear my sentiments and what I can allege in support of them and then are angry with me for declaring them or urging anything in their justification: and did I, like most courtiers, manage your favour more than I consult your interest, I should perhaps, like them, run as little risk of losing the one, and be as little faithful to the other, but chime in with everything your Majesty says, and never let you know the objections that would be made to any measure you had a mind to take till it was too late to alter it. But, for following a contrary conduct and telling your Majesty what is and will be said to combat your inclination in this point, your Majesty treats me as you would one of the most determined Jacobites in the Opposition, who was only saying those things to thwart your will and to distress your affairs in Parliament. That which hurts me most upon this occasion is, that when I feel I wish nothing so much as to pro-

[3] Meaning in Parliament.

mote your Majesty's pleasure, and to contribute all in my small power to the security and prosperity of your Government, I am always answered as if I was arguing against both, and as if I was pleading for the interest of England in opposition to your Majesty's; when in reality I use the terms of your interest and the interest of England indifferently, and as synonymous, and look upon them, not only in this question but in all others, as insuperably blended and united.

"If your Majesty was never to be told what would be urged in objection to any measure you had a mind to take, how could you be provided with answers to such objections?—and if those objections are of real weight, do those serve you best who, to avoid your displeasure, suffer them to be made by your enemies, too late for you to profit by them, or those who venture to incur your displeasure by representing them whilst it is yet in your power to avoid being exposed to them? Would your Majesty choose to hear an objection to a measure you have taken from the lips of those who wish ill to your Government, when it must come as a reproach; or from the mouth of those who wish well to all your measures, and when that objection may come time enough to be a warning? In my situation it is impossible for me to have any interest separate from that of your Majesty and your family; and, besides being the weakest of mankind if I thought I had, I must be also the most ungrateful, considering all the distinctions you honour me with, and the obligations you are daily heaping upon me, if my duty to your Majesty was not always the first consideration in my thoughts.

"This is a very long preface to the business I proposed to treat of in this paper, but your Majesty will, I hope, have some indulgence to my gratifying the earnest desire I feel to set my real motives for all I ever say on this subject in a true light; and whatever you find in this paper which you dislike or disapprove, I beg your Majesty would impute to the error of my judgment, not my want of affection, and correct the imperfections of the one without punishing me as you would do, and as I should deserve, if there were any deficiency in the other. I know the whole plan of my conduct since your Majesty has allowed me the honour of being near you has been to

please and serve you; and I must have very ill luck if that penetration, which makes you know so well the characters of all about you, permits you so far to mistake mine as to doubt one moment of this truth. But to come at last to the political point on which I have the misfortune to differ from your Majesty, I own my great and short maxim with regard to peace and war for this country is, that we can never be gainers at the end of a war; and that we are always, whilst it lasts, both actual losers by the expense of it and negative losers by the suspense of our trade; which is so much the vital breath of this nation that the one cannot subsist whenever the other is long stopped. The best exit, therefore, England can ever hope to make at the end of war is to conclude it in as good a situation as she began it. But, notwithstanding this general rule, I do not say it is such a one as is never to be departed from; the question therefore at present is whether this is one of those occasions in which this rule ought to operate or no? Your Majesty says it ought not; and the reason you give for it is 'the balance of power in Europe, which England ought always to keep, because sooner or later England must feel the ill effects of that balance being broken.'

"In answer to this, I cannot help saying, that it was often, and sometimes I think not quite unjustly, objected to the conduct of some ministers in the late reign, that we were generally so much in haste to be meddling with every little dispute upon the Continent, that we frequently, instead of holding the balance of Europe, were jumping ourselves into the scale, and becoming parties where we ought only to have been umpires.

"As to the present dispute, I have often told your Majesty, and have often been reproved for it without being yet convinced, that I cannot see it is of any great importance to England in particular, or to the balance of Europe in general, whether Italy be in the hands of the Emperor or not. If the dispute lay merely between the Houses of Austria and Bourbon, Naples and Sicily being taken from the Emperor and given to Don Carlos would certainly make a considerable variation in the balance of grandeur in those two families; but as it is the power of France and the power of the Emperor which it is our business to preponderate, so I own I look upon

this change of the dominion of Italy as very immaterial—in the first place, as it is no acquisition to France; and, in the next, as I think it very disputable whether it be any loss to the Emperor. The possession of Italy enabled the Emperor to enrich a Viceroy of Naples and a Governor of Milan, but he got little or nothing by it himself: and the occurrences of this year have shown that the money he raised on these countries was not sufficient to pay for their defence and defray the charge of keeping forces enough on foot to maintain the possession of them. Would it then be advisable, if this be the case, to engage this nation in a war (the bent of the people and the immediate interests of the nation being against it) only to regain Italy for the Emperor, and merely to satisfy the pride of a man who has made that quality so often troublesome to your kingdoms, Madam, and to your family?

"I grant there is a national hatred among the people of England to France; but personal hatreds are always stronger than national enmities, and it is impossible to imagine any foreign prince can be more universally hated in this country than the Emperor is at present. His behaviour with regard to the Ostend Company, and in the first Treaty of Vienna, and indeed the whole series of his conduct towards England since the last war to this hour, has been the occasion of implanting these seeds of dislike, and of their taking such deep root.

"The people of England think he has infinite obligations to them, and they infinite disobligations to him; they talk of him in every coffeehouse as the proudest, the weakest, and most ungrateful of mankind; and, with the scars of the last war still marked upon us in a debt of fifty millions, it would, in my opinion, be very difficult, if not impossible, to persuade this nation to open new wounds that should leave the marks of fifty millions more, only to pleasure a prince on whom they would be glad, if they could do it without hurting themselves, to inflict any mortification, or to bring any disgrace.

"I will now suppose, for argument's sake, that it is material for the balance of Europe that Italy should be possessed by the Emperor; and were it so, could England engage in a war to regain Italy for the Emperor without Holland?—No. Why?—Because, in the first place, it would in all probability

be ineffectual; and, in the next, because it must indisputably throw the trade of all Europe into the hands of Holland, if Holland remained neuter. Can you persuade Holland into the war?—No. Your Majesty says, by Horace's letters of late, you think yes. But is not Horace sanguine in his reports? and will not one of the strongest reasons which induce your Majesty to wish Holland engaged in a war be one of the strongest in the breast of those who now govern Holland to keep out of it? I mean (to speak very plain) the obligation you think Holland would be under, in case of war, to make a stadtholder. We tell the Dutch ministers, that, if we and they put no stop to the progress of the arms of France, and do not prevent the too great reduction of the Emperor's strength, Holland and England will only have the poor comfort of being last ruined. But people in power fear no ruin like the loss of their power; and, consequently, the Dutch ministers will never come into any measure by which they apprehend they must begin with giving up what they would last part with.

"If England and Holland do not come into a war, what will be the consequence? France is weary of a war by which she gets nothing but the honour of conquering for others; Spain will be glad, by a peace, to secure what they have got by the war; and the Emperor to regain to a daughter what he himself has lost. How will that be done?—By the marriage of an archduchess to Don Carlos. Your Majesty and the King I know are both averse to giving a prince of the House of Bourbon any chance to sit on the Imperial throne. But if you will not or cannot assist the Emperor to regain what he has lost by war, how can you object to his doing the best he can for himself by peace?—and what is it that gives your Majesty such a reluctance to seeing a prince of that House Emperor? Your Majesty cannot imagine that when he is Emperor the ties of blood will ever hold princes together whom views of interest separate. The Emperor for the time being and the King of France, though they were brothers, could never be friends; mutual jealousies and national interests would get the better of all consanguinity or former personal friendships. It never was, nor ever will be otherwise: and, if I may take the liberty to give an example in your own family,

Madam, I would be glad to ask whether your Majesty would not laugh at anybody that apprehended any bad consequences from the too close union of the King of England and his cousin-german and brother the King of Prussia.

"This way of reasoning, I own, Madam, would prevent my being afraid of aggrandizing the House of Bourbon by a marriage of an archduchess with Don Carlos, even if the Emperor, to preserve the indivisibility of his hereditary Austrian dominions, should desire to give him his eldest daughter; and I am very sure there is nothing I should apprehend so much as bringing this country into the calamities of war without the utmost necessity; as putting your Majesty's Government under the extreme difficulty of finding money to support it—as exposing you to the unpopularity of declaring war—and raising such clamour and discontent in this country, as, joined to the resentment of foreign powers, might bring your own crown at last into dispute, and your present security into danger.

"I shall say, Madam, but one thing more on this subject, which is, that, though your Majesty's friends may be divided in their opinion with regard to your entering into this war, your foes are united in theirs; since I do not believe there is one enemy in this country to your Majesty's person and Government, one man whom disappointment or disobligation has estranged to your interest, or one whom principle or hope of reward has attached to the interest of the Pretender to your crown, who does not secretly wish this measure concluded, and is only silent on the subject at present for fear of diverting your Majesty from a step by which they hope to inflame the minds of your subjects, alienate their affections, and perhaps stir them to sedition.

"These are the crude, indigested notions of a very zealous and faithful servant, which I have drawn into so great a length that I will not add to that transgression by making any other excuse for them than saying they are the result of a mind constantly active for your Majesty's service, and the overflowings of a heart warm with duty, gratitude, and affection."

The inaccuracy with which this paper is drawn, and the little method observed in laying the substance of it

together, sufficiently show how hastily it was written; but I chose rather to give it incorrect and genuine, than better dressed and not original. And though the political tenets of it were so repugnant to the opinion of the Queen, yet the dutiful and affectionate terms in which those tenets were delivered operated so strongly, that she was more taken by the one than irritated by the other; and, after the receipt of this letter, behaved to Lord Hervey rather with added than diminished favour.

There is one thing which I cannot help remarking here, very different from the common style of memoir-writers, and that is, the difficulty and sometimes the impossibility of coming at truth, even for those who have, to all appearance, the best information. For example, in the paper Lord Hervey gave the Queen, he takes notice of her having told him that Horace Walpole's letters gave information of the Dutch not being now so averse to taking part in the war as they had been; and when Lord Hervey told Sir Robert Walpole that he wondered Horace would write in that style, since it must make Sir Robert's part in keeping out of the war more difficult, Sir Robert Walpole utterly denied it, and said, the style of Horace's late despatches was so very different from what the Queen had reported them, that the King but the day before had told Sir Robert Walpole that his brother talked more like the Pensionary of Holland[4] than the Minister of England.

About this time one Wasner,[5] a sensible man, in

[4] The Pensionary Slingelandt was opposed to our policy, as he was to the House of Orange.

[5] So both Lord Hervey and Horace Walpole spell the name; in the despatches in *Coxe*, it is *Wassenaar*.

great favour with the Emperor, was sent here, without any character, to sound the King and Queen, and to confer with Sir Robert Walpole; in short, to pick up what intelligence he could, and report at Vienna the situation in which he found this country, as well as the disposition he discovered in the Prince, the Minister, or the people, with regard to the part England should act in the present circumstances of Europe.

The King and Queen declined seeing him in private for fear of giving umbrage to Kinski, by the discredit it would bring upon him to have it thought the affairs of the Emperor here were to be transacted by other hands; they therefore corresponded with him privately by messages, carried backward and forward by Mr. Poyntz, which gave great disquiet to the Duke of Newcastle, who saw perpetual whispers and secrets going on between the King and Poyntz, and knew not the subject of them. Of this disquiet the Queen (one day whilst the King was speaking to Poyntz in a corner of the drawing-room) took notice to Sir Robert Walpole, and said, smiling, "I beg you see the uneasiness of the Duke of Newcastle at that whispering; if Lord Harrington was alarmed I should not wonder." The latter part of what she said alarmed, I think, Sir Robert Walpole, who did not like a growing interest of this kind, which seemed to be nourished merely from its own root.

Poyntz, as I have said before, differed in opinion, or at least in discourse, from Sir Robert Walpole on the measure of war; however, he reported fairly to the King and Queen that Wasner owned he was so pleased with what Sir Robert Walpole had said to him

on this subject, and so much convinced by Sir Robert's reasoning that accommodation was the interest of the Emperor, that he wished his master listened to such counsellors, and could hear Sir Robert Walpole talk on this subject only one hour at Vienna.

Wasner (as he told Poyntz) transmitted to the Emperor everything he had heard Sir Robert Walpole say.

But the Queen, tenacious of her own opinion and impatient to have her will fulfilled, was not at all satisfied with the result of this conference between Wasner and Sir Robert. She proposed Wasner should have persuaded Sir Robert into her measures, and not that Sir Robert should have convinced Wasner of the propriety of his own. When Sir Robert told me this, and complained of the Queen's conduct, he farther added, that her Majesty, finding Wasner more tractable than Kinski, had sent him away, which he said was unfair and below her. But I think in this he did not do the Queen justice; for Wasner (as I told Sir Robert) did, at his first coming here, declare his stay was to be short, and that he was to go, as he now did, from hence to Portugal, to settle some business the Emperor had at that Court.

Soon after Wasner's departure a new engine was played: the Bishop of Namur, under the name of Mr. Mosley, arrived in England from Vienna,[6] upon the same errand that Wasner came, but undertaken and

[6] See an account, agreeing substantially with Lord Hervey's, of this strange man and his mission, in the *Walpole Papers*, and particularly in Mr. Walpole's letter to his brother, 22nd October, 1734. (*Coxe*, iii. 184.)

executed in a very different manner—Wasner having been chosen by the Emperor as a proper man for such a commission, and the other having offered himself, and solicited an employment to which he was altogether unequal. The real name of the Bishop of Namur was Strickland: he was an Englishman by birth, but born of Roman Catholic parents and educated in that religion abroad. Nobody could say he was a fool without being unacquainted with him or so well acquainted with his profligate manners as to be prejudiced against his understanding; but he had only those sort of parts that put people on many projects, and make them apter to despise difficulties than to get over them.

Notwithstanding his profession, and the great rise he made in it, he had passed his whole life in gluttony, drunkenness, and the most infamous debauchery. Nor was his dissolute conduct confined to one country; for, as he had been in most Courts of Europe, so in every one of them he had left the fame of his abandoned profligacy.

In the reign of the late King he came into England, and by the credit he then had amongst the Roman Catholics here, under the pretence of serving them, was of use to the Government by betraying all their counsels: in return for which honest services he got to be nominated by the late King of Poland, at the intercession of the late King of England, for a Cardinal's hat; which nomination he sold to the Emperor for one

---

The Bishop, who died and was buried at Namur in 1743, was the youngest son of Thomas Strickland, who had been Privy Purse to Charles II., and followed James II. into France.

of his favourites, for a sum of money and the presentation to the Bishopric of Namur.

He obtained leave of the Emperor at this time to go into England, by telling his Imperial Majesty that the reason why England had not yet engaged in his quarrel was, that the ignorance and stupidity of Kinski made him incapable of managing this great negotiation; and, in the next place, that Kinski was so disagreeable to the English Court, that his desiring anything was sufficient alone to make the English Ministers averse to it. To these arguments he added that of his own interest at the Court of England being so good, that with the assistance of his dexterity, which he placed in no mean rank, there were few things he was not capable of bringing about.

The reward he proposed for his services, if he succeeded, was a new nomination to a Cardinal's hat, and with these views he came to England, thinking, after he came hither, to impose upon our Ministers by bragging of his interest at Vienna, as he had imposed upon the Emperor by boasting of his interest here, in order to be sent hither.

That one single man could hope to play these two Courts in this manner upon one another, at a time that he knew, too, he was obnoxious to the ministers of both, may sound very extraordinary, but it was certainly fact; and his embassy met with the fate that anybody but himself might have expected, and, consequently, nobody but such a coxcomical adventurer in politics would have tempted.

At his first coming over he had an audience of the King that lasted two hours, in which he failed not to

set forth, in the most advantageous descriptions, the great favour in which he stood with the Emperor, and the influence he had at present in all the counsels of Vienna; intimating, too, that at his return from this embassy he should immediately be declared First Minister. He told the King at the same time that his affection to his native country, and his gratitude to his Majesty's father and family, would always make him look on the interests of England and his Majesty as what he ought to consider equal to that even of his master; and that he hoped for these reasons the King and the Queen, in answer to the letters he had brought from the Emperor and the Empress, would have the goodness to speak of him as a man not disagreeable to this Court.

The King, as his custom always was upon such occasions, took care to hamper himself by no particular promises, but in general said many civil things to the Bishop, talked at large on the present situation of Europe, and dismissed him from this audience better satisfied with the situation of his affairs than he ever was after.

Sir Robert Walpole, having got the better of Kinski and Wasner, was not for encouraging the growth of these hydras' heads, and therefore resolved to give no assistance, or even countenance, to the Bishop of Namur; and the Bishop, at every conference he had with Sir Robert, finding him not to be shaken in his resolutions against war, perceived he should certainly fail in the promise he had made the Emperor of bringing England into it. He therefore tried another way, and by caballing underhand with his former friend Mr. Pulteney, and others in the Opposition, endeavoured

to distress the Minister as much as the Minister had distressed him.

Sir Robert Walpole, having dogged and traced him to every place he had frequented from his first coming to England, soon found what he drove at, and told the King and Queen he suspected some double game playing by the Emperor, and that the Bishop had been sent here to foment discontents, and form intrigues to disturb the Government, in case he found the Court determined not to enter as rashly into his quarrel as he wished they should.

He had likewise dogged the Bishop (though now near three-score) several times to a little scrub house of no good reputation, where he used to go late at night on foot, and wrapped up in a red rug riding-coat. This he told also to the King and Queen, knowing how useful it is to throw ridicule on those whom one wishes to depreciate, and how serviceable it is in such cases to add contempt to dislike.

At last Sir Robert Walpole got leave to have letters written to Vienna to acquaint the Emperor with the Bishop's clandestine correspondence with the enemies of the Government; to complain of it; and desire, if the Emperor did not mean to countenance such practices, and had given him no authority for taking these steps, that he might be recalled: which he was, by very explicit and peremptory orders from the Emperor, immediately after the receipt of these letters.

Kinski, who had been jealous of the Bishop of Namur from his first arrival here, and hated him heartily, was so pleased with Sir Robert Walpole for not protecting him and getting him recalled, that this

incident reconciled them entirely; Kinski, as ignorant people are apt to do, looking on the contingent benefit he drew from Sir Robert Walpole's policy as a favour he received from his friendship.

In this manner finished the embassy of the Bishop of Namur, whose indigested, wild schemes might have been just pardonable errors in a young, hot-headed, enterprising fellow of five-and-twenty, but in a hoary fool of five-and-fifty were altogether inexcusable. A man like him, practised in Courts, and long acquainted with the mysteries of state, as well as of the church, ought to have known that the proficients in the one as well as the other, how easy soever they may find it to deceive their inferiors, never deceive one another.

The only sign of cleverness the Bishop of Namur showed in the whole course of this transaction was in the excuse he made to the Emperor for holding any correspondence with those who were in opposition to the Court. The reason he gave for it was that he found the King and Queen inclined to the war, but overruled by Sir Robert Walpole, whom no arguments or persuasions could shake; if therefore he could have broke Sir Robert Walpole's power, he said, the future Ministers, to whom he had promised the support of the Court of Vienna, he had obliged in return to promise their support to the Emperor in the war. But this availed him little: the Emperor wanted succours, and the Bishop a cardinal's hat; and the Bishop, being unable to procure for the Emperor what he desired, was unable to obtain from him what he himself desired.

All this summer the Queen used to see Sir Robert Walpole every Monday evening regularly, and at other

times casually; but at every conference she had with him (as he told me), though she always said he had convinced her, and that she would give in to the accommodation, yet day after day, for three weeks together, she made him put off the setting on foot those measures which ought to have been taken in consequence of that conviction. And what is very surprising, yet what I know to be true, the arguments of Sir Robert Walpole, conveyed through the Queen to the King, so wrought upon him, that they quite changed the colour of his Majesty's sentiments, though they did not tinge the channel through which they flowed. When Lord Hervey told Sir Robert he had made this observation, Sir Robert said it was true, and agreed with him how extraordinary it was that she should be either able or willing to repeat what he said with energy and force sufficient to convince another without being convinced herself. However, said Sir Robert Walpole, "I shall carry my point at last; but you, my Lord, are enough acquainted with this Court to know that nothing can be done in it but by degrees; should I tell either the King or the Queen what I propose to bring them to six months hence, I could never succeed. Step by step I can carry them perhaps the road I wish; but if I ever show them at a distance to what end that road leads, they stop short, and all my designs are always defeated. For example, if we cannot make peace, and yet I can keep this nation out of the war a year longer, I know it is impossible but England must give law to all Europe: yet this I dare not say, since even this consideration would not keep them quiet if they thought peace could not be obtained; and for that reason I graft

as yet all my arguments on the supposition that peace will be effected. I told the Queen this morning, 'Madam, there are fifty thousand men slain this year in Europe, and not one Englishman; and besides the satisfaction it is to one's good nature to make this reflection, considering they owe their safety and their lives to those under whose care and protection they are, sure, in point of policy, too, it is no immaterial circumstance to be able to say, that, whilst all the rest of Europe has paid their share to this diminution of their common strength, England remains in its full and unimpaired vigour. Your Majesty accuses me always (if I may call it an accusation) of partiality to England, and considering nothing else; but whatever motives of partiality sway me, ought they not naturally with double weight to bias you, who have so much more at stake?'"

Lord Hervey asked him if these things made no impression upon her? He said, "Yes, for a time; but the partiality she has to her own opinions, or to the gratification of her own will, sometimes even against her opinion, turns her again; and if that bias or her inclination can make her own opinion bend, you cannot wonder, my Lord, if it proves too strong sometimes for mine."

Lord Hervey said, "For your own sake, Sir, I wish the people of England could know the obligations they have to you, and how often you risk the favour that supports you, to employ it, whilst you are possessed of it, for their welfare and advantage; but I own to you, considering the disaffection there is already in the kingdom to those we serve, and how much it is the interest of us all to keep that disaffection from spreading, I had

rather, as well as I love you, that you should lose the popularity of being known so to fight the people's cause than have it known at the same time against whom you are obliged to combat. For if we who wish them well, and whose interest and inclination it is to support them, cannot help feeling something within us that recoils on these occasions, what effect must the same reflections have on the minds of those who are as much prejudiced against them as we are prepossessed for them; and would be as glad of a handle to abuse their conduct and blacken their characters as we should be of the means to defend the one or brighten the other!"

I cannot help here making a short digression by way of apology for the frequent use I find myself obliged to make of my own name, notwithstanding all the resolutions I made against it when I undertook this work, the promises with which I set forth to avoid it, and the endeavours which in the progress of it I have often made use of to comply with so decent and proper a rule laid down to myself. In reading the works of other memoir-writers, I own I have frequently been shocked with the same behaviour; and knowing, by corresponding accounts of the times they treated of, how much an inferior figure they made in the picture when drawn by other hands than when painted by their own, I have imputed to their vanity what from experience I now find may have been owing to necessity; for, as authors in these cases must chiefly relate such transactions as they themselves have had some little concern in, and for the satisfaction of their readers, even in facts where they were not concerned, are forced to introduce their own name to clear up the manner in which those facts

came to be known to them; so it is impossible but the authors of such writings, let them be ever so inconsiderable, must, in transmitting things to posterity, mention themselves much oftener than at first may seem necessary to the readers; and, consequently, from reasons very different from those to which the readers may ascribe them, and from which, considering the universal propensity mankind have to talk of themselves, it may be very natural for posterity to think such manner of writing proceeds.

And since I am entered into apologies for the defects of this work, I cannot omit making one for the loose, unmethodized, and often incoherent manner, in which it is put together. This is owing to the little leisure I have for writing or correcting; the incapacity, consequently, I am under of recopying my first draughts; and my setting down day by day the things herein contained, just as they occur and whilst they are fresh in my memory. But now my excuse is made, I must add, too, in favour of this work, that by these means, though the style may be less pure, the transitions less natural, and the facts less artfully connected, yet that for which such sort of writings ought to be most valued, which is fidelity in the recital, will certainly be better preserved than it could be in any other way of compiling and transmitting them. By what I have said I find I have done as people generally do when they voluntarily confess any fault in themselves, which is making it a prelude to bragging of some merit which they are more proud of than they are ashamed of the other; hoping at the same time that under the plausible show of ingenuity in the one they may bias their commenta-

tors to have a better opinion of their truth in the other.

If I was much concerned for the pleasure people will take in reading these papers when pleasure and pain will be sensations no longer known to me, I should lament, too, the little importance of the occurrences and incidents belonging to the times in which I write and of which I treat. Few readers give great attention but to great events, and such were not the growth of this country in the age I am describing; a minister ruled it who was more anxious to keep his power than to raise his fame, and wisely lived to his present interest, and not to the embellishment of a page in future story: he knew that palliatives, delays, and gentle methods were the ways to keep power, though active and enterprising steps may sometimes be the means to gain it, and, in imminent dangers, violent remedies necessary to restore it. But this was not his case—"*Callistus prioris quoque regiæ peritus, et potentiam cautis quam acrioribus consiliis tutius haberi:*"—"Callistus, with the experience of the former Court, thought that power was more safely maintained by cautious than by more violent counsels."—(*Tacitus.*) He knew, whatever happened, he could be nothing greater than what he was; and, in order to remain in that situation, his great maxim in policy was to keep everything else as undisturbed as he could, to bear with some abuses rather than risk reformations, and submit to old inconveniences rather than encourage innovations. From these maxims, which in my opinion he sometimes carried too far, he would never lend his assistance nor give the least encouragement to any emendation either

of the law or the church, though the expenses and hardships of the first, and the tyranny and injustice of the last in the ecclesiastical courts, were got to an excess wholly unjustifiable and almost insupportable. From this way of reasoning he opposed the inquiry into the South Sea affair, the bill to vacate the infamous sale of Lord Derwentwater's estate, the examination of the House of Commons into the affairs of the charitable corporations and the abuses in the gaols, besides many other crying instances of flagrant injustice and oppression, which he could not defend, and yet declined to correct by an extraordinary method, though, in the ordinary course of justice, he and all the world knew it was impossible to come at the offenders, put any stop to the offences, or give any redress to the injured. One might with great truth say of Sir Robert Walpole what Tacitus does of Tiberius,—"*Nihil æquè Tiberium anxium habebat quàm ne composita turbarentur*:"—"Tiberius's greatest anxiety was, that what was settled should not be disturbed."[7] This apprehension, long experience and thorough knowledge of this country and this Government had taught him; and in this way of thinking, the unsuccessful deviation he had made from it in the Excise scheme had now more than ever confirmed him. But, how right soever this policy might be in general, it exposed him to very severe censures in particular cases; his enemies often asserting, too plausibly, that there was not a knave in the kingdom who might not reckon upon his protection and be sure of

[7] Horace Walpole says, "Sir Robert's grand maxim of government was *Quieta ne movete*—a maxim quite opposite to those of our days."—*Walpoliana*, § 107.

escaping if parliamentary inquiry was necessary to convict him.

To whom then can a history of such times be agreeable or entertaining, unless it be to such as look into courts and courtiers, princes and ministers, with such curious eyes as virtuosos in microscopes examine flies and emmets, and are pleased with the dissected minute parts of animals, which in the gross herd they either do not regard or observe only with indifference and contempt?

CHAPTER XVII.

Reception of the Prince and Princess of Orange in Holland—Horace Walpole's unsuccessful Negotiations—Details and tracasseries about the Princess of Orange's lying-in—She sets out for Harwich—Suddenly returns—Illness of the Queen—Confidential Communication of Sir Robert to her Majesty—Alarm lest the King should have overheard it.

BUT to return to my narrative of the transactions of this summer. Horace Walpole, who had been sent to prepare the way of the Princess Royal on her first going to Holland, soon after her arrival there returned to England, ashamed of all his disappointments, and at the same time boasting of his success. When he bragged to Lord Hervey how well he had managed matters, and assured him that the Dutch would do nothing without us, Lord Hervey, who had no mind to let Horace believe him his dupe, said, "We knew that before you went; but will they do anything with us?" To which Horace, under the ministerial refuge of affecting to know more than he would tell, only replied, "*That you will see.*"

How the Princess Royal was received in Holland, or what she did there, is little worthy of any particularising account. She felt, I suppose, as unabated pride generally feels in diminished grandeur; and as she did not care to let down that pride to cajole the people of the country, nor the people of the country care to do anything to gratify it, she neither pleased there nor was pleased. She passed a solitary life, with music and

books, and found no consolation for having quitted England but the prospect of soon returning thither.

There was something very remarkable passed in Holland previous to her arrival there, which I forgot before to relate. The governing people in Holland were so apprehensive of an insurrection of the populace on the arrival of the Prince and Princess of Orange at the Hague, that they determined to frame some excuse for taking measures to prevent any bustle, and yet to impute those measures to some other cause than the true one, which they did not care to own. The reason given was this: they pretended the common people were so possessed with fear upon account of an ancient prophecy foretelling that this year, in the month of May, all the Protestants would be massacred by the Papists, that, in order to prevent disorders consequent to the apprehensions the people were in of the completion of this prophecy, some measures to preserve the peace ought to be taken; whereupon they ordered a strong guard to patrole night and day about the town, who upon the least tumult were to seize every man concerned in it. But, notwithstanding these precautions, the Prince of Orange's coach, when he came to the Hague, was surrounded by a mob of several hundred people; and whilst those at a distance only hallooed out his name with common acclamations and huzzas, some of those who hung at his coach-doors told him they wished for nothing so much as to see him Stadtholder, and asked him if they should go and pull down or fire the houses of all those who opposed him. The Prince of Orange, knowing the strength of these his partisans not to be equal to their zeal, nor their power to serve him ade-

quate to their good wishes, was forced to reprove them for what he secretly thanked them, and wisely took the turn of seeming solicitous to correct and keep down that spirit which, if it had been more general or less impotent, he would have doubled his endeavours to stimulate and inflame.

Soon after this (as I have before said) the Prince of Orange went to the Rhine, and the Princess Royal returned to England. As soon as she arrived in England she declared herself with child, which she said she had not done in Holland lest it should have been made a pretence for keeping her there.

Horace Walpole, soon after she came over, was again sent this summer to Holland, and now in the character of ambassador. But Mr. Finch,[1] who was at this same time at the Hague in the character of envoy, was so disobliged at this coadjutor being sent thither, that he desired to be recalled, and quitted the King's service; thinking his capacity (which was a very mean one) equal to the most delicate transactions of state, and not comprehending, though it had been as good as he thought it, that yet Sir Robert Walpole, considering the present circumstances of things, might choose rather to confide in his own brother in an affair where the utmost secrecy was required than in a brother to my Lord Winchelsea, and one who was brought into the world by Lord Carteret, owed everything to his favour, and still lived with him in the strictest friendship.

Horace was every way unsuccessful in this embassy.

[1] The Right Honourable William Finch, brother to the seventh and father to the eighth Earl of Winchelsea, long minister at the Hague.

In the first place he went over with a new scheme to bring the Dutch into the war: this miscarried. Then he made a strange, tedious, complicated, injudicious plan of accommodation: that was disapproved; and, after being discussed here and considered at Paris, was laid aside, to the great satisfaction of our King, who told Sir Robert Walpole, "I am glad there is an end of Horace's stuff, which I never thoroughly understood, but what I did understand of it I disliked." Horace then tried his skill upon a more private affair, and wrote to the Princess Royal to tell her all the Dutch who wished well to her and her husband were very uneasy at her staying in England, for fear (though they were told the contrary) that she should intend to lie-in here. He gave it as his humble opinion, too, that the Prince of Orange would take it better if she came over and waited his return from the camp in Holland, than if she stayed in England till he sent for her. And at the end of this well-judged epistle he desired her Royal Highness to make her own use of this hint without showing his letter to the Queen.[2]

The Princess Royal, who hated the thoughts of re-

[2] Lord Hervey's judgment must have been warped by the influence of the royal ladies when he thus sneered at Mr. Walpole's very judicious advice; and that he did not volunteer, but was invited by the Princess herself to give his opinion (which he knew would displease), is shown by one of his own letters to his brother:—

"*Hague, Oct.* 22, 1734.—The Princess Royal now complains to my wife of me for not writing to her; I can't tell how to do it, because I don't know what is offensive and what is inoffensive: this I know, what is most for their interest is not most to their minds, and I have not ill nature enough to advise anybody, when they ask my opinion, to act against their interest."—*Coxe*, iii. 184. We shall see presently that Lord Hervey, and everybody else save the Princess, soon came round to Mr. Walpole's opinion.

turning to Holland, cried the whole morning after receiving this letter, and, as soon as ever she had read it, carried it with red eyes and wet cheeks to her mother. The Queen, who was almost as unwilling to part with her daughter as she was to go, called Horace an officious fool, and wrote to him, half in jest and half in earnest, to bid him mind his politics, not meddle with what he did not understand, and leave the regulation of her daughter's conduct to her own prudence, who knew much better what was proper than he could tell her. She asked him if he thought her daughter had nothing to do but to be crossing the seas for his pleasure, and said she was sure his only reason for giving this fine advice was his being *ennuyé* in Holland and wanting the Princess to come and play at whist with him.

The King tipped Horace the "puppy" once or twice upon this occasion, and Sir Robert, finding the stumble his brother had made and not being able seriously to take his part, joined in the laugh against him. The imagining that such advice would be welcome to the Princess Royal, or that she would conceal such a letter from the Queen, were two suppositions extraordinary even for Horace's judgment to proceed upon. But his itch of meddling and his awkwardness in touching drew him into eternal difficulties and scrapes, out of which his brother's power and dexterity united were oftentimes barely sufficient to extricate him. Horace hated following directions, though they were ever so good, and loved giving them, though they were ever so bad; but with such perverse obstinacy in one case, and such unfortunate impotence in the other,

one must wonder at his great rise in the world, though one cannot at the ridiculous figure he made when so unbecomingly exalted. For he was of that class of men to whom court honours and royal favours, instead of lessening contempt, add to it by making the qualities that first procure contempt more conspicuous, and putting them in an eminence that makes ridicule universal; half the world laughing at him from knowing he deserved it, and the other half doing it upon trust, and because it was the fashion.

Nor would Horace take warning from this disgrace he met with upon meddling with the Princess Royal's conduct with regard to her going back immediately to Holland, but would try his skill again upon the same subject; and, as people generally do when they try to mend, only made the rent still wider. That she was to lie-in in Holland was determined; but the dispute was whether at Lewarden or the Hague: the Princess herself had a mind to the Hague, for convenience, society, and assistance; Horace advised Lewarden; and the wise reason he gave for it was, that, as the people of Friesland were entirely devoted to the Prince of Orange, and at the Hague there was a strong party against him, so it would be much more just and reasonable to please those who were firm in his interest than those who were divided and but imperfectly so; whereas I fear, in policy, whatever gratitude may suggest, Princes ought, where people are to be gained, to argue very differently, and bestow their favours rather in bribes to acquire friends than in rewards to those who are under an incapacity of acting in any other character.

The Prince of Orange himself, M. Duncan his first

Minister, and all his best friends, were united in their opinions for the Princess's lying-in at the Hague; and Duncan went so far as to say he supposed Mr. Walpole wanted something of Monsieur * * *[3] (the Prince of Orange's great enemy) to be done for England, which he proposed to buy by sacrificing the Prince of Orange's interest in this point to obtain it.

At last, however, it was settled by the King and Queen, who thought it for the dignity as well as interest of their daughter, that she should lie-in at the Hague; and, notwithstanding Her Royal Highness's reluctance to quit England, the time was now come that made it necessary for her to take that grating resolution. The Prince of Orange, who had already quitted the Imperial camp, and was making a short tour in Germany, sent M. Grovestein (one of the gentlemen of his bed-chamber) to England to let the Princess Royal know he should be at the Hague in a fortnight, and ready to receive her. The tears she shed on this occasion were carefully hidden from Grovestein, but flowed in great abundance whenever he was not present.

After a consultation of physicians, midwives, and admirals, about the manner of her voyage, it was determined she should embark at Harwich, and the yachts were accordingly sent thither to wait for her.

The Queen was most unaffectedly concerned to part with her daughter, and her daughter as unaffectedly concerned to leave England, and exchange the crowds and splendour of this Court for the solitude and obscurity of her own. Lord Hervey was with her in the morning

[3] A blank in the original MS.; probably Slingelandt.

[21*st Oct.*] before she set out, the only man (except her favourite, Mr. Schutz[4]) whom she desired to attend her; and, whilst he led her to her coach, she insisted on his writing to her constantly, to give her an account how all those hours passed in which she used to have her share. She had Handel and his opera so much at heart, that even in these distressful moments she spoke as much upon his chapter as any other, and begged Lord Hervey to assist him with the utmost attention. In an hour after she went Lord Hervey was sent for as usual to the Queen, who was really ill, but was thought to say she was so, only from a desire to lay the disorder occasioned by the departure of the Princess on some other cause, and was therefore now as little credited when she said she was sick as she had often been when she said she was well. Lord Hervey found her and the Princess Caroline together, drinking chocolate, drowned in tears, and choked with sighs. Whilst they were endeavouring to divert their attention by beginning a conversation with Lord Hervey on indifferent subjects, the gallery door opened, upon which the Queen said, "Is the King here already?" and, Lord Hervey telling her it was the Prince, the Queen, not mistress of herself, and detesting the exchange of the son for the daughter, burst out anew into tears, and cried out, "*Oh! my God, this is too much.*" However, she was soon relieved from this irksome company

---

[4] This was, I presume, Augustus, the elder of two sons of Baron Schutz, a German who came over with George I. and settled his family in England. Augustus had been equerry to George II. when Prince, and became Master of the Robes and Privy Purse to the King, with whom he was in great personal favour.

by the arrival of the King, who, finding this unusual and disagreeable guest in the gallery, broke up the breakfast, and took the Queen out to walk. Whenever the Prince was in a room with the King, it put one in mind of stories one has heard of ghosts that appear to part of the company and are invisible to the rest: and in this manner, wherever the Prince stood, though the King passed him ever so often or ever so near, it always seemed as if the King thought the place the Prince filled a void space.

The Princess Royal, who in her way to Harwich was to lie the first night at Colchester, on her arrival there found letters from the Prince of Orange to let her know he could not be at the Hague by some few days so soon as he intended; and upon the receipt of these letters she took the resolution of going back the next day [*22nd Oct.*] to Kensington. The first intelligence the King and Queen had of her designing to return was seeing her actually returned, and entering the room where they were, when they thought her at sea: the Queen received her with a thousand kisses and tears of joy, the King with smiles and open arms; a reception she bragged of afterwards to everybody, and one she was more pleased with, from the doubts and anxiety she had felt on the road of its not being so favourable.

This step, indeed, was approved by nobody, and only not censured by the King and Queen. It was thought not very obliging either to the Prince of Orange or the people of Holland, nor very prudent with regard to her own circumstances to double the fatigue of such a journey; the wind, too, when she turned back, was as fair as it could blow; and what increased the con-

demnation of her conduct was, that the Prince of Orange, hearing of the time she was to set forward, travelled himself night and day to meet her, and was actually at Helvoetsluys expecting her arrival as soon as it was possible for her, had she gone on, to have landed there.

The day [29*th Oct.*] before the birthday the Court removed from Kensington to London; and the Queen, who had long been out of order with a cough and a little lurking fever, notwithstanding she had been twice blooded, grew every hour worse and worse: however, the King lugged her the night she came from Kensington, the first of Farinelli's performances, to the opera, and made her the next day go through all the tiresome ceremonies of drawing-rooms and balls, the fatigues of heats and crowds, and every other disagreeable appurtenance to the celebration of a birthday. There was a strange affectation of an incapacity of being sick that ran through the whole Royal Family, which they carried so far that no one of them was more willing to own any other of the family ill than to acknowledge themselves to be so. I have known the King get out of his bed, choking with a sore throat, and in a high fever, only to dress and have a levee, and in five minutes undress and return to his bed till the same ridiculous farce of health was to be presented the next day at the same hour. With all his fondness for the Queen, he used to make her in the like circumstances commit the like extravagances, but never with more danger and uneasiness than at this time. In the morning drawing-room she found herself so near swooning that she was forced

to send Lord Grantham to the King to beg he would retire, for that she was unable to stand any longer. Notwithstanding which, at night he brought her into still a greater crowd at the ball, and there kept her till eleven o'clock.

On the birthday, Sir Robert Walpole, who had been ill of a flying gout for some time, told Lord Hervey he did not care to go to any of the feasts, and would come and dine with him, by which means he should be ready with less trouble to go up to the Queen in the evening, when he could catch her at leisure.

Sir Robert Walpole used always to go into Norfolk twice in a year, for ten days in the summer and twenty in November, and generally set out for his second expedition the day after the King's birthday: he was to do so now, and therefore to take his leave this evening of the Queen. Between six and seven he went up to her from Lord Hervey's lodgings, and stayed there near two hours. After inquiring much of the state of her health, and finding it very indifferent, he entreated her to take care of herself, and told her, "Madam, your life is of such consequence to your husband, to your children, to this country, and indeed to many other countries, that any neglect of your health is really the greatest immorality you can be guilty of: when one says these sort of things in general to princes, I know, Madam, they must sound like flattery; but consider particular circumstances, and your Majesty will quickly find what I say to be strictly true. Your Majesty knows that this country is entirely in your hands—that the fondness the King has for you, the opinion he has of

your affection, and the regard he has for your judgment, are the only reins by which it is possible to restrain the natural violences of his temper, or to guide him through any part where he is wanted to go. Should any accident happen to your Majesty, who can tell into what hands he would fall—who can tell what would become of him, of your children, and of us all? Some woman, your Majesty knows, would govern him; for the company of men he cannot bear. Who knows who that woman would be, or what she would be? She might be avaricious; she might be profuse; she might be ambitious; she might, instead of extricating him out of many difficulties (like her predecessor), lead him into many, and add those of her own indiscretions to his: perhaps, from interested views for herself and her own children (if she happened to have any), or from the natural and almost universal hatred that second marriages bear to all the consequences of a first, she might blow up the father against the son; irritate the son against the father, the brothers against one another; and might add to this the ill treatment and oppression of the sisters, who, with their youth and bloom worn off, without husbands, without fortunes, without friends, and without a mother, might, with all the éclat of their birth and the grandeur of their education, end their lives as much objects of pity as they began them objects of envy. To these divisions in the palace, the natural consequences would be divisions in the kingdom; and what the consequences of those would be, it is much more terrible to think of than difficult to foresee."

The Queen wept extremely whilst Sir Robert was speaking to her, and then answered in this manner:—

"Your partiality to me, my good Sir Robert, makes you see many more advantages in having me, and apprehend many greater dangers from losing me, than are indeed the effects of the one, or than would be the consequences of the other. That the King would marry again, if I died, I believe is sure, and I have often advised him so to do; but his good sense, and his affection for his family, would put a stop to any such attempts as you speak of in a second wife, or at least would prevent their coming to the height you describe; and as for his political government, he has now such a love for you, and so just a value for your services, as well as such an opinion of your abilities, that, were I removed, everything would go on just as it does. You have saved us from many errors, and this very year have forced us into safety, whether we would or no, against our opinion and against our inclination. The King sees this, and I own it; whilst you have fixed yourself as strongly in favour by an obstinate and wise contradiction to your Prince, as ever any other minister did by the blindest and most servile compliance."

Sir Robert thanked her extremely for all her goodness and kind thoughts of him: "But you know, Madam (said he), I can do nothing without you; whatever my industry and watchfulness for your interest and welfare suggest, it is you must execute: you, Madam, are the sole mover of this Court; whenever your hand stops, everything must stand still, and, whenever that spring is changed, the whole system and every inferior wheel must be changed too. If I can boast of any success in carrying on the King's affairs, it is a success, I am very free to own, I never could

have had but by the mediation of your Majesty; for if I have had the merit of giving any good advice to the King, all the merit of making him take it, Madam, is entirely your own; and so much so that I not only never did do anything without you, but I know I never could; and if this country have the misfortune to lose your Majesty, I should find it as impossible, divested of your assistance, to persuade the King into any measure he did not like, as, whilst we have the happiness of possessing your Majesty, any minister would find it to persuade him into a step which you did not approve."

After this Sir Robert Walpole proposed putting off his journey, which the Queen insisted he should not do; he then said he would desire Lord Hervey to give him every post an exact account of her health, and begged her Majesty would order Lord Hervey to send it from her own mouth undisguised.

From the Queen's apartment Sir Robert Walpole returned directly to Lord Hervey's, sent for him from his company into a private room, and there told him everything that had passed above; adding at the same time how uneasy he was at the condition in which he had found the Queen, and was obliged to leave her, coughing incessantly, complaining extremely (which in slight indispositions she never did), her head aching and heavy, her eyes half shut, her cheeks flushed, her pulse quick, her flesh hot, her spirits low, her breathing oppressed, and, in short, all the symptoms upon her of a violent and universal disorder.

He told Lord Hervey he had proposed to the Queen to defer his journey into Norfolk, and said, notwithstanding all she said against, that he would stay,

did he not think that, in his own state of health, the air and exercise of this expedition was absolutely necessary to fit him for going through the parliamentary fatigues of the winter.

Lord Hervey said he saw no use Sir Robert Walpole could be of to the Queen in her illness, but that he owned he was sorry the foreign affairs were not better settled before his departure. Sir Robert Walpole said, "I am sure there will be no alteration made in them in my absence; the King having given orders for the letter to be sent which is to carry his consent to Don Carlos's marriage with the Archduchess, and the Queen has promised me there shall be no expressions in the letter that can be construed by the Emperor to be any promise of assistance by force from England, in case the mediation of England for peace should prove ineffectual. I convinced her how proper it was to steer clear of such engagements, by telling her it would always be time enough to give the Emperor assistance with force, if it should in futurity be thought expedient and advisable so to do; but that there could be no good in making promise of it beforehand, or even in giving such hints as might make assistance expected; in the first place, because such hopes might make the Emperor more refractory in schemes proposed for accommodation; and in the next, because they might afford him a handle to reproach England in case we did not assist him, that it was upon account of the hopes given that we would that he had resolved to run the hazard of another campaign; in which event, whatever losses he sustained, his resentment against those by whom he would say he was drawn in to suffer such misfortunes

and disgrace would be full as great as against those by whom they were actually inflicted.

Lord Hervey told him he firmly believed the Queen now intended to do what Sir Robert Walpole had advised; "But consider, Sir," continued he, "how often she has advanced, and how often retreated; consider, too, what effects the opportunity of your absence and the importunity of those who differ from you may have on her mind, and consequently on the King's counsels, when, talking the sentiments of her heart and the dictates of his inclination, they shall try, with such powerful auxiliaries on their side, to efface the impressions you have left upon her reason—impressions made with so much difficulty and received with so much reluctance. You know how often this letter has been ordered, and how often countermanded; how often it has actually been written, and yet not sent, from being conceived in terms either not approved by those who counselled its being written, or by those who were so unwillingly persuaded to order it. You yourself once told me that, when first this scheme of accommodation was proposed, the King said he would rather risk his Crown than suffer a Prince of the House of Bourbon to have any chance to sit on the Imperial Throne. This you got over, and gained his consent: when you had done so, and the Duke of Newcastle had orders to say to the Court of France that the King had consented to the match, you, in order to make this measure seem a little consistent with the language that had been talked to that Court at the time of the Treaty of Hanover, were forced to dress up this letter with many palliative expressions, pleading the necessity of the

times, the alteration of circumstances, the exigency of affairs, and several other particulars that were to reconcile these opposite ways of acting in different seasons, and that looked as if this was a measure to which England was rather forced than inclined. Accordingly, when this letter so drawn was sent to the King, his Majesty, who was not under the same obligations as his Ministers to manage appearances and reconcile this step with that of the Hanover Treaty, sent back the letter to his Grace of Newcastle with no other comment than these words written at the bottom of it:—'*I do not like this despatch, and will not have it go.*' Upon this the Duke of Newcastle fretted, the King stormed, and you were forced to be quiet; reproached by his Grace, snapped by his Majesty, and your distress laughed at by the Queen, who was glad to see that accidentally postponed which you had worried her into forwarding."

Sir Robert Walpole to this replied, that Lord Hervey went back to a season when the Queen rather yielded than concurred, and acquiesced without being convinced; but he assured him that now she was brought over entirely to his way of thinking: in which opinion he either flattered himself (deceived by the Queen, and the propensity everybody has to believe they convince when they persuade), or he endeavoured to deceive Lord Hervey by saying what he wished, and not what he thought.

During this conference Lord Hervey told Sir Robert Walpole that he feared the King had overheard everything that had passed this evening between him and the Queen. Sir Robert started at this, and said, "*If he has, it is impossible he can ever forgive me;*

but what reason have you, my dear Lord, to think so?" "I will tell you," replied Lord Hervey. "As soon as you left me, having something to say to the Princess Caroline, and knowing she always left the Queen when you came to her, I went up to her apartment to take that opportunity of speaking to her: not finding her there, I went to the Queen's pages, asked of them where she was, and from them I learned that the King, with his three eldest daughters, when you came to the Queen, went into the bed-chamber, which you know is the next room to that where the Queen and you were together. When I heard this, and reflected on what you once told me at Kensington of his shutting himself up in a closet, and leaving the door ajar to listen to a conference between the Queen and you, I immediately concluded that from the same curiosity he had now done the same thing." "*For God's sake* (said Sir Robert Walpole), *find out whether it was so or not, and let me know before I set out to-morrow morning for Norfolk.*" Accordingly Lord Hervey, going immediately up to the ball, there told Princess Caroline that he had been at her apartment this evening, had not found her at home, and wondered where she had been: upon which she presently told him, that as soon as Sir Robert Walpole came to the Queen, the King, with her and her sisters, went through the Queen's bed-chamber and the younger Princesses' apartment down to their governess's lodgings, my Lady Deloraine.

Lord Hervey was not a little pleased to find his conjectures had been false, and quickly made Sir Robert Walpole easy by a short note to tell him what the case

had been: the next day Sir Robert set out for Norfolk, and soon after the Princess Royal again for Harwich, where I shall leave her for some time, and return in my narrative to St. James's.

The following passage, evidently a fragment of a somewhat undutiful criticism of the Princess Royal on her father, appears in the MS., but the words that should have connected it with the text are lost:—

* * * "his giving himself airs of gallantry; the impossibility of being easy with him; his affectation of heroism; his unreasonable, simple, uncertain, disagreeable, and often shocking behaviour to the Queen; the difficulty of entertaining him; his insisting upon people's conversation who were to entertain him being always new, and his own being always the same thing over and over again; in short, all his weaknesses, all his errors, and all his faults were the topics upon which at Kensington, the summer after she was married (when she was most with Lord Hervey), she was for ever expatiating."

CHAPTER XVIII.

Lady Suffolk—Rupture with the King—Goes to Bath—Resolves to retire—Sentiments of the Royal Family, Walpole, and the Public on this change—Dodington discarded by the Prince—Favour of Lyttelton—Princess of Orange puts to sea from Harwich, but returns—Proceeds at last by Calais—Foreign Affairs—Marriage of Don Carlos—Church Promotions—Hoadley reluctantly advanced to Winchester—Struggle for and against Rundle—Benson and Secker appointed to Gloucester and Bristol, and Rundle to Derry.

THE interest of Lady Suffolk with the King had been long declining: his nightly visits all last winter had been much shorter than they used to be, and not without sometimes a total intermission. His morning walks, too, this last summer resembled his nightly visits the preceding winter; and all those who saw them together at the commerce-table in the evening in his private apartment plainly perceived they were so ill together that, when he did not neglect her, the notice he took of her was still a stronger mark of his dislike than his taking none. At Richmond, where the house is small, the walls thin, and what is said in one room may be often overheard in the next, I was told by Lady Bristol, mother to Lord Hervey, the lady of the bedchamber then in waiting (whose apartment was separated from Lady Suffolk's only by a thin wainscot), that she often heard the King talking there in a morning in an angry and impatient tone; and though generally she could only distinguish here and there a word, yet

one morning particularly, whilst Lady Suffolk, who always spoke in a low voice, seemed to be talking a long while together, the King every now and then interrupted her by saying over and over again, "That is none of your business, madam; you have nothing to do with that." The lady who told me this, being a little addicted to weave fable in her narratives, I should not have given credit enough to her story to insert it had she not related it to me before the transactions of the summer, and consequently when she could not do it from that vanity, as natural perhaps to her as to many other people, who love, upon the arrival of a remarkable incident which few expected, to tell you some circumstances by which they endeavour to show they were, by their great sagacity or good intelligence, much earlier apprised of it than the gross herd of the world.

Towards the latter end of the summer Lady Suffolk, who had long borne his Majesty's contempt, neglect, snubs, and ill humour with a resignation that few people who felt so sensibly could have suffered so patiently, at last resolved to withdraw herself from these severe trials, from which no advantage accrued but the conscious pride of her own fortitude in supporting them with prudence.

On the pretence, therefore, or, more properly speaking, on the plea of ill health, she asked leave to go for six weeks to drink the Bath waters; from thence she returned the day before the birthday [*30th Oct.*] to St. James's, but the King went no more to her apartment; and when he met her in the Queen's dressing-room spoke to her with the same indifference that he would have done to any other lady of the

Queen's family, asking her only some slight common drawing-room question.

That the King went no more in an evening to Lady Suffolk was whispered about the Court by all that belonged to it, and was one of those secrets that everybody knows, and everybody avoids publicly to seem to know.

Various were the sentiments of people on this occasion. The Queen was both glad and sorry: her pride was glad to have even this ghost of a rival removed; and she was sorry to have so much more of her husband's time thrown upon her hands, when she had already enough to make her often heartily weary of his company, and to deprive her of other company which she gladly would have enjoyed.

I am sensible, when I say the Queen was pleased with the removal of Lady Suffolk as a rival, that I seem to contradict what I have formerly said in these papers of her being rather desirous (for fear of a successor) to keep Lady Suffolk about the King, than solicitous to banish her; but, in describing the sentiments of the same people at different times, human creatures are so inconsistent with themselves, that the inconsistencyof such descriptions often arises, not from the mistakes or forgetfulness of the describer, but from the instability and changeableness of the person described.

The Prince, I believe, wished Lady Suffolk removed, as he would have wished anybody detached from the King's interest; and, added to this, Lady Suffolk having many friends, it was a step that he hoped would make his father many enemies; neither was he sorry, perhaps, to have so eminent a precedent for a prince's discarding a mistress he was tired of.

The Princess Emily wished Lady Suffolk's disgrace because she wished misfortune to most people; the Princess Caroline, because she thought it would please her mother: the Princess Royal was violently for having her crushed; and when Lord Hervey said he wondered she was so desirous to have this lady's disgrace pushed to such extremity, she replied, "*Lady Suffolk's conduct with regard to politics has been so impertinent that she cannot be too ill used;*" and when Lord Hervey intimated the danger there might be, from the King's coquetry, of some more troublesome and powerful successor, she said (not very judiciously with regard to her mother, nor very respectfully with regard to her father), "*I wish, with all my heart, he would take somebody else, that Mamma might be a little relieved from the ennui of seeing him for ever in her room.*" At the same time the King was always bragging how dearly his daughter Anne loved him.

Sir Robert Walpole hated Lady Suffolk, and was hated by her, but did not wish her driven out of St. James's, imagining somebody would come in her place who, from his attachment to the Queen, *must* hate him as strongly, and might hate him more dangerously.

The true reasons of her disgrace[1] were the King's

[1] There can be little doubt that her marriage with Mr. George Berkeley —to which her retiring from Court was a necessary preliminary—must have been already settled, though it did not take place till next year; as it seems from the 'Suffolk Correspondence,' that the journey to Bath was made with his privity and advice, and he accompanied her thither, where there was assembled a society of her old friends that could not be very agreeable to the Court—Chesterfield, Pulteney, Pope, &c. It is very likely that she might not have thought of this marriage if she had not felt her favour on the decline, but it was calculated to reflect back on her resignation something of a natural and voluntary character.

being thoroughly tired of her, her constant opposition to all his measures, her wearying him with her perpetual contradiction; her intimacy with Mr. Pope, who had published several satires, with his name to them, in which the King and all his family were rather more than obliquely sneered at; the acquaintance she was known to have with many of the opposing party, and the correspondence she was suspected to have with many more of them; and, in short, her being no longer pleasing to the King in her private capacity, and every day more disagreeable to him in her public conduct.

About a fortnight, therefore, after her return from the Bath, finding the King persist in withholding his usual visits, she took the resolution of quitting the Court.[2] She neither had, nor desired to have (that I ever heard, at least), any éclaircissement with the King, or to take any leave of him; but asked an audience of the Queen, with whom she was above an hour and a half alone, and resigned her employment of Mistress of the Robes. The next day she left the Palace and went to her brother my Lord Hobart's house in St. James's Square.

---

[2] Lady Suffolk left Bath on the 26th of October, arrived in town the 29th, and resigned on the 11th of November.—*Suff. Cor.*, ii. 119. The Duke of Newcastle thus announces the event to Sir Robert Walpole, then in Norfolk:—

"Nov. 13, 1734.—You will see by the newspapers that Lady Suffolk has left the Court. The particulars that I had from the Queen are, that last week she acquainted the Queen with her design, putting it upon the King's unkind usage of her. The Queen ordered her to stay a week, which she did, but last Monday had another audience; complained again of her unkind treatment from the King—was very civil to the Queen—and went that night to her brother's house in St. James's Square."—*Coxe*, iii. 209.

What she said to the Queen I never could learn, and, considering all circumstances, it must be very difficult to guess; since I cannot imagine the mistress could say to the wife, "*Your husband not being so kind to me as he used to be, I cannot serve you any longer;*" and for any other reasons Lady Suffolk could allege for quitting the Queen's service, I am as much at a loss to comprehend what they could be as I believe she was to invent them.

This great Court revolution was for some time the talk of the whole town. Those who were inclined to make it a topic of invective against the King said it showed the hardness of his nature, that, after Lady Suffolk had undergone twenty years' slavery to his disagreeable temper and capricious will, after she had sacrificed her time, her quiet, her reputation, and her health to his service and his pleasure, he could use a woman of her merit, prudence, and understanding so ill as to force her to this step, and for no other reasons than her having, contrary to the servile conduct of most courtiers, risked his favour in consulting his interest, and ventured to tell him those disagreeable truths which few favourites have honesty and regard enough for their benefactors to impart, and fewer princes sense enough to bear being informed of, though for want of such information in time so many princes have been at last undone.

To have heard Lady Suffolk's friends, or rather the King's enemies, comment on this transaction, one would have imagined that the King, instead of dropping a mistress to give himself up entirely to a wife, had repudiated some virtuous, obedient, and dutiful wife, in

order to abandon himself to the dissolute commerce and dangerous sway of some new favourite.

Those who justified the King upon this occasion said it was very natural for a man of so uxorious a turn, and so passionately fond of his wife, to think little of any other woman, especially at his time of life; and that nobody surely could imagine there was any great immorality or any great injustice in his giving those hours to the Queen which he used to pass with Lady Suffolk; nor was it very surprising that, in consulting his pleasure only, he should prefer the conversation of a woman who was all cheerfulness, resignation, and compliance, to that of another who was for ever thwarting his inclinations, reflecting on his conduct, and contradicting his opinion; that he should like one who was always flattering him better than one who was always finding fault with him; or be more pleased with her who was always solving difficulties than with her who was always starting them. It was further added, that, since the King intended to continue Lady Suffolk's pension, sure she had no reason to complain, or to think the punishment inflicted on her for censuring his Ministers and condemning all his measures a very severe one, since it was nothing more than his withdrawing himself from hearing what he could not prevent her from uttering.

The malcontents were extremely pleased with this new acquisition to their party, and exulted much in the hopes of this ungrateful conduct of the King's, as they called it, towards Lady Suffolk, occasioning great clamour, and increasing the odium which these indus-

trious anti-courtiers lost no opportunity of propagating against him; but it was a great alloy to their joy, and a great satisfaction to those they opposed, to see this back door to the King's ear (the only way by which any reflections on his Ministers could be conveyed) at last shut up: nor was it matter of less sorrow to one party than joy to the other to imagine that, after so signal a sacrifice to the Administration, few people in the palace, though ever so well disposed to the Opponents or disaffected to the Minister, would venture, by the same remonstrances to the King, to incur the same fate; everybody, both friends and foes, being equally persuaded that the example of this wreck would deter any other person from sailing near those rocks on which Lady Suffolk had split.

As to the clamour this event would occasion, they must know very little of the nature of Courts or mankind who flatter themselves that the disgrace of one person, let that person be ever so amiable or considerable, would be anything more than the novel of a fortnight, which everybody would recount and everybody forget; or that an enemy out of the Court would ever be able to give material disturbance to those whom they vainly endeavoured to molest whilst they were in it.

In this manner, then, after twenty years' duration, ended the nominal favour and enervate reign of poor Lady Suffolk, who never had power enough to do good to those to whom she wished well, though, by working on the susceptible passions of him whom she often endeavoured to irritate, she had just influence enough,

by watching her opportunities, to distress those sometimes to whom she wished ill.

About the time of this disgrace there happened another, in the Prince's Court, of a very different nature; I mean that of Mr. Dodington, which began now to be commonly known and publicly talked of, but in a manner very unlike that in which people spoke of Lady Suffolk's. For as, in Lady Suffolk's case, many, from political considerations, rejoiced at her removal, though none from personal enmity rejoiced at her misfortunes, so with regard to Mr. Dodington it was just the reverse: nobody in a political light thinking it of any consequence whether he was in or out of the Prince's favour; and everybody, from personal dislike to the man, being glad of his meeting with any mortification. Mr. Dodington, whilst some people have the *je ne sais quoi* in pleasing, possessed the *je ne sais quoi* in displeasing, in the strongest and most universal degree that ever any man was blessed with that gift—being, with good parts and a great deal of wit, as far from agreeable in company as he was, notwithstanding his knowledge and his great fortune, from being esteemed by any party, or making any figure in the State. He was one of those unfortunate people whom it was the fashion to abuse, and ungenteel to be seen with; and many people really despised him, who naturally, one should have imagined, were rather in a situation to envy him. His vanity in company was so overbearing, so insolent, and so insupportable, that he seemed to exact that applause as his due which other people solicit, and to think he had a right to make every auditor his admirer.

The reason the Prince gave for disliking and discarding him was, "that he hated those trimming dastard souls that had not resolution enough to oppose those whom they were always condemning; and could never think such men honest as were always abetting those measures in public which they were always censuring in private; any more than he could ever approve people's conduct who were perpetually acting openly in concert with the very men that they were for ever secretly abusing and defaming."

Right sentiments these, and pompous expressions; but the Prince's heart was no more capable of giving birth to such sentiments, than his capacity was of clothing them in such words. Lord Chesterfield had repeated these sayings till the Prince had got them by heart, and then gave them as his own reasons for doing, from honesty and judgment, that which in reality he did from levity and weakness.

The Prince used to say, too, that it was impossible but that there must be something very wrong in a man who not only had no friend, but whom everybody who mentioned him at all spoke of as an enemy.

Mr. Lyttelton,[3] a nephew of Lord Cobham's, whom Dodington had brought about the Prince, had contributed too to this disgrace; for Dodington, from irresolution, or fear of throwing the Prince (as I have said before) into the hand of those who were at the head of the opposing party, had dissuaded the Prince from going those lengths to which Lord Cobham and Lord Chesterfield, who were exasperated to the last degree

[3] Afterwards Sir George and Lord Lyttelton, now about 25 years old.

against the Court, wished to drive him. Lyttelton, therefore, who did and said everything his uncle, Lord Cobham, wished he should, was for ever, by proxy from Lord Cobham, suggesting at one ear what Lord Chesterfield was administering in person at the other, both of them inculcating that Dodington's game was so to play the Prince's favour as to keep him in a sort of *équilibre* till he found to which party he could sell his Royal Highness to the best advantage.

Among many other things which Lyttelton suggested to the Prince to depreciate Dodington, he once said to him, "Though I hate Sir Robert Walpole myself, and think him a bad man and a bad Minister, yet, when I reflect how partial he has formerly been to Dodington, the favours he has conferred upon him, the manner in which he brought him into the world, and the credit in which he supported him there, I own I am shocked when I hear Dodington railing at him; and though all he says may be true, yet the obligations he has to Sir Robert Walpole make me hate the ungrateful man who can forget them; and I feel myself more exasperated against Dodington for publishing and exaggerating Sir Robert Walpole's faults than I am against Sir Robert for committing them."

Whilst Lyttelton was saying these things to the Prince, he never reflected that it was Dodington who brought him first to that ear into which he was now pouring them; and that he himself was, consequently, in a stronger degree, the very thing to Dodington which he was so vehemently reviling Dodington for being to Sir Robert Walpole.

This new favourite, Mr. Lyttelton, was, in his figure,

extremely tall and thin;[4] his face was so ugly, his person so ill made, and his carriage so awkward, that every feature was a blemish, every limb an incumbrance, and every motion a disgrace; but, as disagreeable as his figure was, his voice was still more so, and his address more disagreeable than either. He had a great flow of words that were always uttered in a lulling monotony, and the little meaning they had to boast of was generally borrowed from the commonplace maxims and sentiments of moralists, philosophers, patriots, and poets, crudely imbibed, half digested, ill put together, and confusedly refunded.

Dodington's house, in Pall-Mall, stood close to the garden[5] the Prince had bought there of Lord Chesterfield; and during Dodington's favour the Prince had suffered him to make a door out of his house into this garden, which, upon the first decay of his interest, the Prince shut up—building and planting before Dodington's house, and changing every lock in his own to which he had formerly given Dodington keys. Dodington, when he found Lord Chesterfield had supplanted and Lyttelton undermined him, retired into the country unaccompanied and as much unpitied in his disgrace as unenvied in his prosperity.

I shall now return to the Princess Royal, who, the day after she came to Harwich [*Wednesday, 6th Nov.*],

---

[4] Thus described in a caricature and doggrel lampoon of the day:—

"But who is dat bestride a pony,
So long, so lean, so lank, so bony?
Dat be the great orator Lytteltony!"

[5] Part of what was in our day the garden of Carlton House, since built on with little taste, and less regard to public interests.

embarked there for Holland. When she had been some time at sea she grew so ill that she either was, or made all those about her say she was, in convulsions; and the wind not being quite fair, she obliged the Captain of the yacht, after lying several hours at anchor, to tack about and put her again on shore at Harwich. As soon as she arrived there she despatched a courier to London with letters (written, as it was supposed, by her own absolute command) from her physician, her man-midwife, and her nurse, to say she was so disordered with this expedition that she could not be stirred these ten days from her bed without running the greatest danger of miscarrying, nor put to sea again at all without the hazard both of her child's life and her own. All her train wrote in the same style; and the same judgment was made on these proceedings by the King and Queen, the whole Court, and the whole kingdom—which was, that her Royal Highness was determined, if possible, to persuade, entreat, or fright her husband and her parents into consenting that she should lie-in in England.

The King and Queen, though she wrote for orders what she should do, declined giving any, but said the Prince of Orange ought to be consulted, and his directions followed. The Prince of Orange was written to by the same people who had written to the King and Queen, and in the same strain; but he, knowing of what prejudice it would be to his affairs to have the Princess Royal lie-in in England, and seeing plainly it was that she drove at, wrote to his wife to propose her coming by Calais, and to the Queen to beg of her not only not to oppose this proposal, but to expostulate with

her daughter, and forward this expedient, in case she found the Princess averse to it.

These delays made the King, who was always impatient under unavoidable difficulties, but outrageous with those who started any unnecessary ones, so peevish with his daughter that he made the Queen write to say she must and should lie-in in Holland; and, since the Prince of Orange desired she might go by Calais, and that it was thought for her safety she should do so, he consented to it: but this was much against his will, on account of the uncertain terms upon which this Court now was with the Court of France. At the same time that the King ordered the Duke of Newcastle to let M. Chavigny know that the Prince of Orange desired the Princess Royal might go by France into Holland, he charged his Grace to insist on her being received there entirely as a private person; and that there might not at St. James's be all the bustle of a new parting, which must have been the consequence of a new meeting, he ordered the Princess Royal to go across the country the nearest way from Harwich to Dover, without coming by London. But his Majesty being afterwards informed that those roads were impassable at this time of the year in a coach, he said, then she might come to London and go over the bridge; but that positively she should not lie-in in London, nor come to St. James's. Accordingly, after all her tricks and schemes to avoid going to Holland, and to get back to London, she was obliged to comply with these orders, and had the mortification and disgrace to go, without seeing any of her family, over London Bridge to Dover [21*st Nov.*], from whence, by Calais

(where the Prince of Orange met her), she went through Flanders to Holland.

Everybody condemned her conduct in this whole affair, in which her passions and her inclinations entirely got the better of her reason and her understanding. In the first place, everybody wondered she should mistake her own interest, and sacrifice her husband's, so far as to desire to lie-in here; and, in the next place, that she should judge so ill as to imagine, though she was imprudent enough to desire it, that it would be possible for her to compass it; or that she should not be deterred by her love to England from showing there were so many difficulties attended her coming hither. Already the resolution was taken and declared, both by the King and Queen, that upon no account would they ever give her leave to come here again when she was with child. The Queen saw all the false steps her daughter had made, and, as she could not quite disown them, blamed them a little, but repined at them more. The King, teased with the difficulties attending this journey, and not extremely pleased with the expense of it (which amounted to 20,000*l.*), said he would positively hear no more about it, and snapped everybody who mentioned the Princess Royal's name. The Princess Emily, as much as she dared, censured and condemned her sister's conduct; the Princess Caroline, as much as she could, excused and softened it. The Princess Emily told Mrs. Clayton she was very glad her sister was to lie-in in Holland, not only for the sake of the Prince of Orange's affairs, for which she thought it absolutely necessary, but because she was sure her brother would have disliked, of all things, her

sister's being brought to bed in England. Mrs. Clayton very pertinently and reasonably replied, "I cannot imagine, Madam, how it can affect the Prince at all where she lies-in, since, with regard to those who wish none of your Royal Highness's family on the throne, it is no matter whether she is brought to bed here or in Holland, or of a son or a daughter, or whether she has any child at all; and, with regard to those who wish all your family well, for your sakes, Madam, as well as our own, we shall be very glad to take any of you in your turn, but not one of you out of it."[8]

During all these transactions the Queen, though mending, continued ill enough to keep her room, and did so till the end of November.

When Sir Robert Walpole came back from Norfolk he affected talking of Lady Suffolk's abdication as a thing that had greatly surprised him when he heard it, disclaiming entirely the having had any hand in her disgrace, though he knew, he said, it had been imputed to his cabals. But this was giving himself a very unnecessary trouble; few people believing that he had not done Lady Suffolk all the ill offices he could, and of those few not one imagining that, if he had not done his utmost to drive her from the palace, it was from any tenderness towards her that he had desired she should remain there.

But, whatever pleasure Sir Robert Walpole might find from this domestic incident, it was much over-

[8] There seems to have been in this conversation a latent allusion to the Princess Royal's prospect of the throne, neither of her brothers being married; and this perhaps may account for the Princess's (otherwise unreasonable) anxiety to lie-in in England.

balanced by the concern he felt from a foreign transaction; for, notwithstanding he was so sanguine when he went into Norfolk, and so secure that nothing could happen to defeat the proposal he had at last brought their Majesties to make at Vienna, of marrying the second Archduchess to Don Carlos, yet his back was no sooner turned but the King and Queen (as Lord Hervey told him they would) relapsed into their former reluctance, or rather abhorrence, to this union: nor was it unsuspected by Sir Robert, though he could never prove it, that the King himself, either by Lord Harrington or by a juggle through some German hand, did convey some hint to Mr. Robinson[7] (the English minister at Vienna) not to be too pressing to bring this affair of the marriage to a successful issue. When Mr. Robinson's answer came back which was to give an account of the conference he had held with the Imperial Ministers in consequence of the commission he had received to treat of this marriage, his despatch was certainly, for the purpose it was to serve, extremely well drawn; that is, it was impossible more plausibly to defeat what his public orders were to promote, or more artfully to gloss over a series of reasoning which, stripped of the florid poetical ornaments with which Mr. Robinson's despatches always abounded, and reduced to a plain narrative, seemed rather to be the production of a German courtier, flattering the unreasonable pride of an Austrian prince, than of an English minister, concerned for the service of his master, the interest of his country, or the repose of Europe.

[7] Afterwards for a short time Secretary of State at home, and created Lord Grantham in 1761.

When Sir Robert Walpole went into the King's closet the day after this despatch arrived from Robinson, the first thing the King said to Sir Robert Walpole was, "You find me with Robinson's letter in my hand, which I have just been reading again for the third time, and I think it the ablest despatch and the best drawn paper I ever read in my life." Sir Robert smiled and made no answer; upon which the King asked him why he did not speak, and desired him to give his thoughts freely upon it. Sir Robert said, the reason why he made no answer was because he would never speak anything but his thoughts, and that those, unless he was commanded to deliver them, it was sometimes more respectful as well as more prudent to keep to himself. "What do you mean?" replied the King. "I mean, Sir," said Sir Robert, "that this is either the weakest or the ablest despatch I ever saw; but which of the two it is, your Majesty can only determine. If Mr. Robinson had no orders but what the Duke of Newcastle conveyed to him, and I was consulted in, Mr. Robinson ought to be recalled by the next messenger that goes to Vienna, and disgraced: if he had any others, those who are ignorant what those orders were can never be proper judges how well or how ill they have been executed." The King seemed disconcerted, and neither denied nor avowed any secret instructions conveyed to Robinson; but said he thought the letter was a very sensible account of those difficulties, unforeseen here, which very naturally arose in the councils of Vienna to a proposal certainly little for their honour, and very doubtfully for their interest. The King turned the conversation, immediately after he had said

this, to some domestic subject, and never entered upon it afterwards. But Sir Robert Walpole, when I have spoken to him of this match being the only natural and safe termination of these squabbles, has always answered, "This match had long ago been perfected, had it not been for Mr. Robinson, who deserved hanging for his conduct in that affair:" adding, that he was as obstinate a German and as servile an Imperialist as Hatolf.

There happened this year some commotions in the Church, proceeding from promotions to be made there, which I must not pass over in silence. The two vacant sees of Gloucester and Winchester gave rise to these contests. But though Winchester was one of the best, and Gloucester one of the worst bishoprics in England, yet the latter occasioned much the greatest struggle, contrary to the common course of ecclesiastical disputes, where the degree of contention is generally proportioned to the degree of profit annexed to the thing contended for.

The bishopric of Winchester, whenever it should fall, had been long promised, both by the Queen and Sir Robert Walpole, to Bishop Hoadley, to palliate the disappointment and the injustice, as he thought it, and most people called it, of Durham having been given to another. This promise had been solemnly and frequently renewed to him during the time in which the Court had applied to him to divert the storm, already mentioned, that threatened, two years ago, from the Presbyterian quarter about the Test Act. Lord Hervey, who had great friendship for Bishop Hoadley, knew that neither the King, Queen, nor Sir Robert Walpole loved him, and would be glad, if they could have found

any way to put him by, not to confer this benefice upon him. Immediately, therefore, upon hearing that the Bishop of Winchester [Willis] was seized with an apoplectic fit, of which it was impossible he should recover, Lord Hervey despatched a messenger to Salisbury, where Bishop Hoadley then was, with the following letter:—

"Kensington, Aug. 7, 1734.

"MY DEAR LORD,

"I HAVE often sent you letters of no consequence, merely for the pleasure of conversing with you, but, for the first time in my life, I hope now to send you one that may be of use to you.

"In short, the Bishop of Winchester is certainly dying, and this messenger comes to charge you, on this critical conjuncture, not to let your natural modesty, and hitherto insuperable awkwardness in solicitation, so far get the better of your prudence as to induce you, Mahomet like, to sit still and fancy the mountain of preferment will walk to you to Salisbury: come up immediately, and in the mean time, since application must be made I need not tell you where (you know the K.'s two ears[8] as well as I do), apply to them both; and, if I may advise, *act* as if you were not secure, and *write* to them as if you were. Be sure you exert yourself on this occasion, and remember you are now shaking that die upon the cast of which the future happiness of your life depends: the odds are of your side, but, as long as there is a possibility of losing, nobody with so great a stake depending can play too cautiously. Do not talk to me of security from former promises; I know Court promises too well to believe they are ever kept, though ever so solemnly made, without being claimed; the best Court paymaster must be dunned, and dunned a good deal—they pay few debts for the honour of paying them; their memories, too, are abominable—I mean to debts of gratitude, not of resentment.

[8] The Queen and Walpole.

"Remember how you failed of Durham—at least, that you were told you failed from silence. Write therefore now, come, speak, dun, and behave, not as your laziness inclines you, but as your interest directs, as common prudence dictates, as your friends advise, and as what you owe to yourself and your family requires.

"Adieu," &c.

The Bishop of Salisbury's answer was as follows:—

"Salisbury, Aug. 8, 1734.

"My dear Lord,

"All the entertainment you have ever given me by your former letters (which has been in truth as great as one ought in reason to wish for) bears no proportion to the real pleasure I had in reading yours this morning; the part you take in my interest, the spirit of friendship which breathes in it, the voluntary advising me in what in truth I need advice—these feel to me more tenderly pleasant, as well as more rationally agreeable, than all that wit and humour which in you I think are inexhaustible. The kind and good advice you give me is the advice of all the packets from my friends at London, and of every heart except my own. But I now yield up that, and am resolved to come up to London; and, as our friend Mr. CC[n]. particularly advised me if this case happened, to write to the Q. herself, as well as to Sir R., from both whom I have had as express assurance of the thing as if one of their messengers, with a postboy before him and a greyhound upon his breast, were sent down to me, upon the prospect of a vacancy, with a strong letter in form. Particularly Sir R. gave me the kindest reception at Chelsea just before I came hither, and, resolved to speak plainly, said these or like words:—'If that vacancy should happen, you are as sure of succeeding as if you were now in possession.' After such words, and so many promises to me, repeated to all my friends, I can no more doubt of that great man's knowing it to be certainly fixed, or of his hearty and effectual concurrence in it, than I can of the plainest thing in the world. But, however, as I have the most express promises, given and renewed without my ask-

ing, to claim upon, I can more easily prevail upon myself to work for myself than I could in a former case in which that particular happiness was wanting. I should be glad of stronger nerves and more courage. Methinks I could go on prating to your Lordship a great while longer (though long enough already you feel) were it not that I have several letters to write by the post of to-day; I therefore must despatch your messenger back again immediately. Adieu. Go on to give me the pleasure of such friendship; and believe me, wherever I am, whether nailed down to the beauties of this place or removed to those of another, whether at Sarum still or at Farnham, I am truly, my Lord,

"Yours, &c.

"I hope to be in Grosvenor Street on Saturday night. I design to thank Lady Hervey myself for her very obliging answer to what I sent her."

Bishop Hoadley took Lord Hervey's advice, and wrote two letters—one to be given immediately to the Queen, and the other to be given to Sir Robert as soon as ever the Bishop of Winchester was dead. Both these letters I saw, but have no copies of them. The substance of them was not solicitation, but a modest claim of the promise that had been made him. Lord Hervey came to the Queen just after she had received this letter, and found her in that froward disposition towards Bishop Hoadley which people generally feel when they find themselves pressed to do that which they would but cannot avoid. She asked Lord Hervey if he did not blush for the indecent conduct of his friend in this early and pressing application for a thing not yet vacant. Lord Hervey assured her it was vacant, for that the Bishop of Winchester was actually dead, and that the Bishop of Salisbury had done nothing but

what all his friends had advised him to, contrary to the dictates of his own natural modesty and backwardness upon those occasions. He added, too, that one of the reasons formerly alleged for Bishop Hoadley missing of the bishopric of Durham was his not having asked it; and that it would be very hard he should have failed in one case for having made no application, and be reproached in another for the contrary conduct. Whilst Lord Hervey was speaking the King came in; and as long as the conversation was continued upon this topic, both the King and Queen spoke of the Bishop in such a manner as plainly showed they neither esteemed nor loved him. It is true the principles which Hoadley professed, and the doctrines he propagated, could be agreeable to few princes, as they could only please such as preferred the prosperity of their people to the grandeur of their Crown, the liberties of their subjects to the increase of their own power, the rights and privileges of mankind to the usurpation of sovereigns, the true end of government to the capacity of abusing it, and the cause of justice to the lust of dominion. Potter, Bishop of Oxford, a great favourite of the Queen's, strongly solicited at this time the vacant bishopric of Winchester; and, as Sir Robert Walpole told me, had certainly obtained it, had he not interposed and told the Queen that the engagements she was under to Hoadley were such that it would be scandalous for her to break through them. Whether this was strictly true I know not, but that Hoadley was at last made Bishop of Winchester is certain; and as certain it is, so extraordinary are some Court events, that this preferment, one of the best in the gift of the

Crown, was conferred upon a man hated by the King, disliked by the Queen, and long estranged from the friendship of Sir Robert Walpole. The truth was, that to palliate a present disappointment they had made reversionary promises which they neither cared to keep nor dared to break. This Hoadley guessed to be the situation of his affairs, and therefore received with no great thankfulness what was bestowed with so little good will—"*apud eum plus prior offensa valuisset quam recentia beneficia*:"—"With him the prior offence had greater weight than the recent favour."—(*Tacitus.*) And Winchester, now reluctantly conferred, atoned not for Durham, formerly unjustly conferred upon another.

However, when this thing was done, the King, Queen, and Sir Robert, all three acted perfectly in character—the King not speaking one word to him either when he kissed his hand or did homage, but contriving, as was often his way, to shock whilst he granted, and to disoblige whilst he preferred. The Queen, on the other hand, when she found she could not put him by, resolved to make the most of promoting him; told him how glad she was to see him advanced as high in dignity and profit as he had long been in merit and reputation, and assured him with what pleasure she embraced this occasion of proving to him the sincerity of all her former professions. She acted this part so well too, that the Bishop afterwards bragged to Lord Hervey of the kind manner in which the Queen had received him; and with all his understanding was the dupe of that insincerity to which he was so near being a sacrifice. In the mean time Sir Robert Walpole, by hints to the Bishop himself, and

by plainer intimations through his friends, arrogated the whole merit of this promotion to himself; and more than insinuated that he had not been able to incline the King and Queen to this choice, but forced them to make it, even against their inclination.

Sherlock succeeded Hoadley at Salisbury; but the Bishop of London, though Sherlock and he lived better together of late than they had done, was pleased with neither of these translations.

To the bishopric of Gloucester, which had now been vacant above a twelvemonth, the Lord Chancellor [Talbot], whilst he was Solicitor-General, had recommended one Dr. Rundle,[9] a chaplain of his father's the late Bishop of Durham, and a particular friend of his own. This man lay under the suspicion of Arianism; but as this was a crime that could not be proved upon him, the objection the Bishop of London made to him was, that about fourteen or fifteen years ago he had in private company spoken disrespectfully of Abraham, which one Venn,[10] a parson then in company, had told to the Bishop of London, and was ready to testify against Rundle upon oath. Those who were inclined to soften the conduct of honest Mr. Venn, said the man had done this out of his enthusiastical zeal for the cause of the Church, and from the simple dictates of a good conscience, to prevent so improper a pastor from

[9] Pope, always ready to join in the opposition to the minister, the court, and the church, endeavoured to disparage the other bishops by selecting the obnoxious Rundle for the peculiar praise of "*having a heart*"—

"*Even* in a *bishop* I can spy desert;
Secker is decent—Rundle has a heart."—Ed.

Such praise was contemptuous to those named, and meant to stigmatize all the others as having neither decency nor feeling.

[10] Richard Venn, the father of the more celebrated Henry Venn.

being intrusted with episcopal authority and a Christian flock. Those who put the worst construction, and I believe the truest, upon this proceeding, said that Venn had acted in concert with the Bishop of London to make his court there, and in order to forward his own preferment in the Church by thus obstructing Rundle's. Nobody doubted but that the Bishop of London's sole[11] reason for opposing Rundle was because my Lord Chancellor had made application to the Court in his favour, not through the Bishop of London, but merely upon his own weight and interest; and as the Bishop of London had always disliked what he called *lay recommendations*, he was determined to make a stand upon this occasion, thinking, if he could show that even so great a man as my Lord Chancellor could not get any one preferred in the Church without applying to him, for the future no other person would attempt it. But as these reasons for opposing Rundle's preferment were such as the Bishop of London could

---

[11] There seem no grounds for imputing this against Bishop Gibson, as his *sole* or even his principal motive. At best it could only have been a *suspicion* or *inference* of Lord Hervey's own; and surely there was in the fact stated (and Lord Hervey understates it) a sufficient cause of objection to Rundle. But in the whole of this narrative the reader should bear in mind Lord Hervey's anti-church prejudices; and *his* partiality to Hoadley and Rundle will certainly not tend to the removal of the suspicions entertained of their orthodoxy.

Horace Walpole gives us the clue to Queen Caroline's patronage of this class of divines. "The Queen's chief study was divinity, and she had rather weakened her faith than enlightened it. She was *at least* not orthodox; and her confidant, Lady Sundon, an absurd and pompous simpleton, swayed her countenance to the *less believing* clergy. * * * As Sir Robert maintained his influence over the clergy by Gibson Bishop of London, he often met troublesome obstructions from Lady Sundon, who espoused, as I have said, the *heterodox* clergy, and Sir Robert never could shake her credit."—*Reminiscences.*

neither urge nor avow, others were to be given to weigh with the Administration, though these only weighed with him. He therefore declared he had no objection to my Lord Chancellor's recommendation, though he had to the man recommended; neither had he any one himself to recommend, or any article to insist upon in this promotion but one, which was to beg, for the love of God, that the King at least would vouchsafe to give the bench a Christian.

Whilst this contest grew every day more warm between my Lord Chancellor and the Bishop of London, many ranged themselves in the party of the first, from regard to his character, but many more from disregard to that of the latter; and most of those who pretended the greatest commiseration for the hard measure given to Rundle, acted on this occasion as mankind every day act on many others, which is, pretending compassion for the oppressed only that they may inveigh with a better grace against the oppressor, whom they affect to dislike for abusing power, whilst they really hate him chiefly for having it.

The Bishop of London, by his intrigues, got most of the other bishops to join with him, and easily persuaded the majority of the inferior clergy to talk in his strain; for much eloquence is never wanting to induce any class of men to list themselves under the banner of that leader who has the chief power of distributing those rewards in the hopes of which they all enter the service. By these means his Lordship himself first blew the flame against Rundle among the clergy, and then made use of that flame as an argument to Sir Robert Walpole to strengthen the suggestions and solicitations of that

very resentment which had raised it. Many pamphlets were written, and with great virulence, on both sides; but the two principals were very differently treated in these productions, for, whilst my Lord Chancellor's name was never mentioned but with decency, the Bishop of London was pelted with all the opprobrious language that envy and malice ever threw at eminence and power.[12]

Sir Robert Walpole, who feared to disoblige either of these great men, but was much more desirous to oblige the one than the other, went to my Lord Chancellor, and begged of him to relinquish his suit in favour of Rundle, offering him at the same time to make Rundle a Dean, or whenever the bishopric of Derry in Ireland should fall, which was now possessed by [Henry Downs], a crazy old fellow of four score, and worth 3000*l.* a-year, to send Rundle thither. He assured him, too, that the King was inclined, as well as himself, to do anything at his request that was reasonable or safe; but as this promotion was so violently opposed by the clergy in general, and the bishops in particular, the King could not, without manifest danger to his own affairs in Parliament, venture to gratify his Lordship on this occasion. He further added that he was sure his Lordship wished so well to the King's affairs and to the common cause, that, however unreasonable he might think the opposition made to Rundle, yet he would not press his promotion to this bishopric if the consequence of it must be the dividing a weight in the House of Lords that had hitherto gone entire, and was so essential to the ease of carrying on the

[12] This, seeing how Lord Hervey joins in the cry, is at least candid.

King's business;—at the same time desiring my Lord Chancellor to recollect what trouble, in the last Parliament, a defection only of five or six Scotch lords had given, and how much more dangerous consequently it would be for the Court to do anything that might make any breach or produce any revolt among the bishops. He told him, too, that the Bishop of London had absolutely refused to consecrate Rundle in case the King persisted in making him a bishop. To which my Lord Chancellor replied, that the Bishop of London must know, if he did refuse to consecrate Rundle, that he incurred a *premunire*. Sir Robert said no, for, as it was the Archbishop's business to consecrate him, it was *he* would incur that penalty in case of refusal; but the Archbishop [Wake] being ill, and the Bishop of London only acting as his deputy, no man can oblige another to act by a delegated power; and consequently the Bishop of London, by refusing to accept of the delegation, would not be liable to the same penalty that the Archbishop would incur in case he were able to officiate and refused it. My Lord Chancellor then said other bishops might be found to do this office, if the Bishop of London would not. "And would you, my Lord," replied Sir Robert Walpole, "advise or desire the King to do that which should bring this question to be debated, and draw a point of his prerogative into dispute that has never yet been controverted? I am sure I will not advise the King to such a step; and whilst I have the honour to serve the Crown, and have any influence in the King's councils, I will rather advise the King never to fill up the see of Gloucester than to do it with such consequences attending it.

My Lord Chancellor said, "According to this way of reasoning, the Bishop of London then must have a negative on every man the King ever nominated to a bishopric; and if this manner of arguing was to prevail, instead of the election made by a Dean and Chapter being only a matter of form, the King's recommendation itself would become only a form, and the Bishop of London must give the King a *congé* to nominate before the King could ever order a *congé d'élire.*"

Sir Robert Walpole said that the case of Rundle was a particular case; and though the Bishop of London could not now relinquish his opposition without losing his interest with the clergy, yet he believed, as the Bishop was heartily sorry he had embarked in this opposition, so, instead of its being an encouragement to give the same disturbance another time, he believed it would prevent him from ever falling into the same error again.

"You acknowledge it, then, to be an error?" interrupted my Lord Chancellor. "I do," said Sir Robert, "but it is one which I fear it is now too late to remedy. For your Lordship, you have certainly acquitted yourself to Rundle by the strenuous part you have taken in soliciting his cause; but, if I may take the liberty of saying it, I think there is a duty you owe the King as well as a duty to your friend. You have discharged the one, and I am persuaded you will never neglect the other; and if the King, in the most gracious and the kindest manner, does get it intimated that he wishes you, in regard to him (unwilling to refuse you and afraid to comply), to urge this suit no farther, perhaps he may expect, when the dispute comes to be between

the endangering his interest or the giving up Rundle, that your Lordship would not give Rundle the preference."

My Lord Chancellor said Sir Robert Walpole had very artfully brought this matter to a point where he must be silent, but that he looked upon his honour to be so much engaged for Rundle that his silence was no sign of acquiescence.

This conversation passed between my Lord Chancellor and Sir Robert Walpole in the summer, and was partly related to me by Sir Robert himself, and partly by Bishop Hoadley, who had it from my Lord Chancellor.

Many people (indeed most people) blamed Sir Robert for his compliance with the Bishop of London's unreasonable objections on this occasion; and said he would one day or other repent consigning to the Bishop of London that absolute authority which he now suffered him to exercise in Church matters, and of which he did not yet feel the inconveniences.

Sir Robert excused himself by saying, whoever had as much power as the Bishop of London would create as much envy, and consequently excite as much clamour against them; and as for the Bishop of London's stickling for Church power, Church discipline, and Church tenets, he thought him in the right, since whoever would govern any class of men must appear to be in their interest. "And I would no more," said he, "employ a man to govern and influence the clergy who did not flatter the parsons, or who either talked, wrote, or acted against their authority, their profit, or their privileges, than I would try to govern the soldiery by setting a General over them who was always haranguing against the inconveniences of a standing army,

or than I would make a man Lord Chancellor who was constantly complaining of the grievances of the law, and threatening to rectify the abuses of Westminster Hall."

Notwithstanding the resolution Sir Robert Walpole made and declared to everybody in the summer, of keeping the bishopric of Gloucester vacant till this dispute between the Lord Chancellor and the Bishop of London could be adjusted, and one of them be brought to temper and prevailed with to recede, he changed his mind; and the Bishop of London insisting on its being filled up, and not with Rundle, Sir Robert Walpole went in form, about a month before the Parliament was to meet, from the King to my Lord Chancellor, to let him know how sorry his Majesty was that it was impossible he could be gratified in Rundle's being made a bishop; but that the King, to show the regard he had for my Lord Chancellor, was willing and ready to prefer any other person whatever whom his Lordship would nominate to that benefice.

My Lord Chancellor replied that he could not so far abet the injustice done to the character of Rundle on this occasion as to give his consent to Rundle's being put by, and by naming another man seem tacitly at least to admit that he had before named an improper man; that he might be conquered by the Bishop of London, but could not yield to him; and must submit to an absolute decision against his friend, but would not, nor could not in honour, listen to any compromise.

Thus ended this conversation. Soon after Dr. Benson was made Bishop of Gloucester, and Dr. Secker Bishop of Bristol—both of them learned and ingenious men, of unexceptionable characters, and both of them for-

merly chaplains to my Lord Chancellor's father, the late Bishop of Durham. This last circumstance was thought to have been weighed in the choice of these men, as a sugar-plum to put the taste of those bitters out of my Lord Chancellor's mouth which they had made him swallow by the rejection of Rundle; and the Irish bishopric of Derry, before mentioned, soon after becoming vacant, Rundle was sent into that lucrative episcopal exile.[13]

---

[13] In which he died in 1743, scarcely sixty years old, having, we are told, overcome, by his amiable qualities, the unpopularity of his nomination. Swift celebrated Rundle's promotion in a copy of verses, which Gilbert Wakefield's anti-church prejudices thought "excellent," but I think nearly the worst he ever wrote, and which, like Pope's praise of Rundle's *heart*, had no object but to insult the other bishops, the clergy, and the Ministry. Indeed, the tone of this defence is a sufficient justification of Gibson's objections, and aggravates the scandal of making a man a bishop in Ireland because he was supposed not to be fit for one in England.

"Make Rundle bishop!—fye—for shame!
An Arian to usurp that name!
Dare any of the mitred host
Confer on him the Holy Ghost,
In Mother Church to breed a variance,
By coupling orthodox and Arians? * *
Rundle a bishop!—well he may,
He 's still a Christian more than they.
We know the subject of their quarrels,
The man has learning, sense, and morals—
There is a reason still more weighty—
'Tis granted he believes a Deity;
Has every circumstance to please us,
Though fools may doubt his faith in Jesus;
But why should he with *that* be loaded
Now twenty years from Court exploded?
And is not this objection odd
From rogues who ne'er believed in God?"

These were the dregs of Swift, and do no honour either to him or Rundle. It is worth remarking that 3000*l.* was then considered a lucrative bishopric, but Derry was returned to the Ecclesiastical Commission, in 1834, at above 14,000*l.* Lord Hervey's third son, Frederic, afterwards fourth Earl of Bristol, held this see from 1768 to his death in 1803.

CHAPTER XIX.

Household Offices—Duke of Richmond Master of the Horse; Lord Pembroke Groom of the Stole; Lord Godolphin's Pension and Peerage—Characters of these two Lords—Ideal Marriage of the Prince of Wales—Parliament meets—30,000 Seamen voted—Reasons for and against—Sir Joseph Jekyll—Marlborough Election—Miss Skerrett—Election Petition of the Scotch Peers—Debate in the Lords on the Troops—Walpole resists the disposition of the King and Queen to War—Public Expenses—Finance—Sinking Fund—Ministerial Changes—Messrs. Winnington and Fox recommended by Lord Hervey—King's Journey to Hanover opposed by Walpole in vain—Madame de Walmoden—Strange confidences to the Queen.

THE new year was opened with an expedient which put an end to the long contest[1] between the Duke of Richmond and Lord Pembroke for the Mastership of the Horse. The expedient was this: Lord Godolphin having often told Sir Robert Walpole, his old and intimate friend, that the holding such an employment as Groom of the Stole—to which so much attendance belonged, and to which he paid so little—made him extremely uneasy, and that there was another thing he wanted to obtain as much as he wanted to get rid of this, which was his peerage to be continued to the collateral branch of his own family of Godolphin,[2] Sir

[1] It had apparently been in suspense since the preceding Midsummer (*ante*, p. 290), though, in fact, the Duke of Richmond had been fixed on, but it was kept secret till Lord Pembroke could be satisfied.

[2] The second Earl of Godolphin had married the great Duke of Marlborough's *eldest* daughter, Henrietta, who succeeded to the Duke's titles and estates; but, having lost their only son, the Marlborough peerages would pass to the Spencers, children of the Duke's *second* daughter, and the Godolphin title would become extinct. Lord Godolphin was therefore anxious to continue a peerage in *his own* family, and accordingly was created, in

Robert Walpole took advantage of these sentiments to propose to the King the making of Lord Pembroke Groom of the Stole, and the Duke of Richmond Master of the Horse, without letting the King know that Lord Godolphin had a mind to quit, but proposing to the King to buy his consent to this accommodation by offering him the peerage to be entailed on his cousin, Godolphin, after his death.

But there were two great difficulties attended the gaining his Majesty's consent to this scheme: the one was, that the King would be at no additional expense, whilst Lord Godolphin, if he quitted, must have a pension; the other was, that the King did not at all relish the entailing a peerage on Mr. Godolphin, who had married a daughter of Lady Portland, to whom both the King and Queen bore a most irreconcilable hatred for accepting the employment of governess to their daughter in the late reign without their consent, at the time they had been turned out of St. James's, and the education of their children, who were kept there, taken from them.

Lord Godolphin's salary as Groom of the Stole was 5000*l.* a-year; and Lord Pembroke's, as Lord of the Bedchamber, 1000*l.* Sir Robert Walpole, therefore, prevailed with Lord Godolphin, in consideration of the peerage which he had so much at heart, to accept of a pension of 3000*l.* a-year, and Lord Pembroke to take the key, with 3000*l.* more, which reduced the expense of this jumble within the limited sum. When Sir Robert Walpole had proceeded thus far in the negotia-

1735, Baron Helstone, with remainder to the heirs of his first-cousin, Henry, Provost of Eton, whose son Francis dying without issue in 1785, that peerage also became extinct.

tion, he acquainted the King with what he had done, who still boggled at giving the peerage, and, not caring to own the true reason, said, there was a time that the Lord Treasurer Godolphin had been as great a Jacobite as any man in the kingdom,[3] and yet Sir Robert Walpole was now urging him to bestow this honour on the heir of his odious family. Sir Robert said it was true, as the Lord Treasurer Godolphin had been page to King James the Second, he was suspected, whilst his old master lived, to whom he had had so many and so great obligations, to have a partiality towards him; but all that partiality had died with King James, and that nobody had ever accused or suspected the late Lord Godolphin of any attachment to his Son, the present Pretender. Sir Robert added to this plea that of the present Lord Godolphin's firm, undoubted, and uninterrupted attachment to his Majesty's family; and said to the King, "*Sir, for my sake I beg your Majesty would grant this boon to Lord Godolphin, and give me leave to look upon it as a particular favour done to one of the best friends I have in the world, at my request.*"

The King made answer, "*You are always teasing me to do things that are disagreeable to me, and for people I dislike.*" However, with much ado Sir Robert got his consent, thanked him for it, and did not leave him time to repent; but, the moment he went out of the closet, sent to all the three Lords to let them know they might come the next morning to kiss the King's hand, which accordingly they did—Duke of Richmond as Master of the Horse, Lord Pembroke as Groom of

[3] Lord Godolphin had been not for *deposing* James, but for substituting the Princess of Orange as *regent*—a scheme which would have excluded the Hanover family.

the Stole, and Lord Godolphin for his Barony entailed on his cousin-german.

Lord Godolphin was a very singular character, for, though he was a man of undoubted understanding and strict honour, yet he passed his whole life with people who had neither. Natural modesty, indolence, and laziness, made him exert himself but little in the great and the busy world; and his chief, if not his only pleasures, being wine and running horses, he passed almost all his time in low company, who could talk sense in no character but that of jockeys; and acted, even in that character, as little like gentlemen as they talked.

Lord Pembroke's character was a very different one; not that he wanted sense, or that he was not very justly esteemed a man of the nicest and strictest honour, but he was quite illiterate; whereas Lord Godolphin was an extremely good scholar, and had a great deal of knowledge: the one, too, was always in bad company, whilst the other was always in the best; and, as Lord Pembroke, being much known, was generally esteemed and had many friends, so the other, from the obscurity of his way of life, was so far from having many friends, that, out of the very narrow compass of his own low acquaintance, he was hardly known to exist.

The points that were expected to give the Administration most trouble this year in Parliament were, an address for the Prince's marriage and settlement, the opposition to the augmentation of the land forces, and the petition of the Scotch Peers. As to the first of these, it was crushed by the Queen, who, authorized by the King, told the Prince it was his Majesty's intention to marry him forthwith; and that, whoever the Prince

had a mind to make this alliance with, the King would not only give his consent but his utmost assistance to complete it. In consequence of this declaration the Queen talked publicly every day of the Prince's being immediately to be married, though nobody could ever learn to whom; and bespoke her clothes for the wedding, and sent perpetually to jewellers to get presents for this ideal future Princess of Wales.

As to the affair of the Scotch petition, it gave as much trouble to the Opposition as to the courtiers: the latter knowing how sore a place it was if it could be laid open; and the former, at the same time they were sensible how much was expected from them by the world on this head, being conscious, too, how little they were able to answer those expectations when they came to collect their materials, and found how weakly their proofs would answer their charge.[4] The English Lords in opposition had a great mind to drop the prosecution; but the Scotch Peers who were concerned in it, and had lost both their employments and their seats in Parliament, insisted on being supported, or at least being fought for. They said they did not understand the equity of having been set in the front of the attack upon the Administration, like the *forlorn hope*, being sacrificed for the sake of the Party, and then deserted by those for whom they had been exposed. On the other hand, the English Lords said in their defence that they had lost their employments as well as the Scotch; and that, for their seats in Parliament, if they held those upon a different tenure, it was what the Scotch knew before they embarked; that what each of them had to lose, they had both ventured and both lost;

[4] See *ante*, p. 334, n. 27.

that if there was the least glimmering of daylight to be seen from this prosecution, any advantage to be proposed, or any success to be hoped for, they would gladly pursue it to the utmost; but, on the contrary, they said, as their proofs were so deficient, so to bring this affair to a public trial would be matter of triumph rather than annoyance to the common enemy, and contribute more to the disgrace than the advantage of their common friends.

However, the Scotch Peers insisted and prevailed; but Lord Carteret, and Lord Winchelsea by his influence, refused positively to take any other part in pursuing this unfruitful affair, or to give any other assistance, than their attendance and their votes; and accordingly they declined after this going to any of the meetings previous to the bringing this affair before the House of Lords; nor did either of them, after it came to that (as loquacious as they were on all other occasions, both in public and private), open their lips in support of the petition during the whole progress of its presentation, suspense, and dismission.

Lord Carteret had more reasons than one for declining fighting on this ground. In the first place, he had always in his eye the prospect of being himself in power, and did not care for weaving fetters for his own hands when he came to be possessed of that much-desired post; in the next, he was not very fond of being enrolled as a lieutenant under my Lord Chesterfield, who had long been looked upon as Commander-in-Chief of this Scotch brigade.

Many people imagined that Lord Carteret's coolness on this occasion proceeded from his being then secretly negotiating his peace with the Court. When I in-

quired of Sir Robert Walpole if there was any truth in this report, he asked me "if I thought him mad enough ever to trust such a fellow as that on any consideration, or on any promises or professions, within the walls of St. James's. I had some difficulty," added he, "to get him out; but he shall find much more to get in again." He told me, too, at the same time, that, to his knowledge, Lord Carteret had opened two canals to the Queen's ear, but that he hoped to prevent either stream having water enough to turn his mill, though he knew one of them ran much stronger than the other. The two people Sir Robert meant were Mrs. Clayton and Bishop Sherlock, the last of whom he alluded to when he spoke of the strongest interest. He owned this winter, too, to Lord Hervey, that his Lordship had been in the right in what he had told him the year before at Richmond relating to the Bishop pushing at his interest; "but, my Lord," said he, "it is not on the Bishop of London's account that he pushes at me—it is Walpole, not Gibson, that he envies; for his eyes are not half so wistfully turned to Lambeth as they are to St. James's, nor is it more his ambition to be at the head of the Church than at the head of the State."[5]

---

[5] Sir Robert could hardly have been serious in this statement. Smarting under some obstruction to his wishes, created by Sherlock's influence with the Queen, he may have said testily that the bishop aimed at being minister, but he could not have thought it. Sherlock may have been busy and ambitious at this period (ætat. 57), but was too sensible a man to dream of being *minister*. His professional aspirings were noticed while he was yet only *Master of the Temple* in the well-known epigram—

"As Sherlock at *Temple* was taking a boat,
The waterman ask'd him which way he would float?
'Which way?' says the Doctor, 'why, fool, *with the stream*,'
To *Paul's* or to *Lambeth*; 'tis all one to him."

He did reach St. *Paul's*, but in 1747 he had, we are told, the moderation and prudence to refuse *Lambeth*.

Lord Hervey said he believed there were very few things which the sanguine vanity of most people did not bring them to think were attainable by their dexterity, and not superior to their merit; but that any man who flattered himself this country was in a disposition to bear a Parson-Minister must know very little of the temper of the present generation.

It is certain, however, that Sherlock's interest at this time with the Queen was strong enough to give some trouble to Sir Robert, but still more to the Bishop of London, who had disobliged many of the Whig clergy, and saw himself every day more and more deserted by the Tory clergy that were running under the wing of Sherlock and soliciting his protection.

Sherlock now and then, too, endeavoured to do Lord Carteret service at Court, but hitherto without success; the manner in which the King and Queen this winter spoke of him being not in the least softened, and the "knave" and the "liar" as often tacked to his name as usual. The Queen, however, in speaking of him and Lord Chesterfield, always gave him the preference. She said Lord Carteret was a *coquin dans le grand*, but Chesterfield was a *coquin dans le petit*;—that the last was incapable of being a very useful servant to his Prince if he would; but that Lord Carteret had really something in him, though he was not to be trusted. She said Lord Carteret was like a candle that, if he was well watched, could give one some light, but that it was dangerous to trust the one as the other out of one's sight; and that both were full as capable of firing one's house if they were not taken care of, as of being useful if they were.

Lord Carteret and Lord Chesterfield were in some things very much alike—in others very different: they were both of them most abominably given to *fable*, and both of them often unnecessarily, and consequently indiscreetly, so; for whoever would lie usefully should lie seldom: they both of them, too, treated all principles of honesty and integrity with such open contempt, that they seemed to think the appearance of those qualities would be of as little use to them as the reality, which must certainly be impolitic, since always to ridicule those who are swayed by such principles was telling all their acquaintance, "If you do not behave to me like knaves, I shall either distrust you as hypocrites or laugh at you as fools."

They had both of them good parts, but parts that were of a very different style: Lord Carteret had a much better public and Court understanding than Lord Chesterfield, and Lord Chesterfield a much better private and social understanding than Lord Carteret; so that this was as much superior to the other in the Senate and the Cabinet as the other was superior to him at table and in *ruelles* [*ante*, p. 295].

When the Parliament met this winter the King opened the Session [23*rd January*] with telling them that the Powers at war had consented that England and Holland should try what they could do towards making a scheme of accommodation, and that accordingly his Majesty and his good friends the States-General were drawing a plan (every article of which was a secret), which he rather wished than hoped might prevent the opening of another campaign, and therefore desired the Parliament would give him a great deal of

money, a great many ships, and a great many troops, in order to enable him to act roughly in case talking mildly should prove to no purpose.

Pursuant to these hints from the Throne, thirty thousand men were proposed this year in Parliament for the sea service. Those in opposition said twenty thousand were sufficient, and argued that there was no necessity for voting a greater number this year than had been granted the last; that the Dutch had made no augmentation either by sea or land this year; and that, as our interests were mutual in the present troubles, so, if no augmentation was necessary for Holland, none could be more necessary for England. It was urged, too, that as a war was chiefly to be avoided on account of the detriment it would be to trade, so that reason ought to operate against an increase of seamen, since the merchants last year had complained grievously of the scarcity of seamen, and consequently of the high wages they were forced to pay them; and if this year ten thousand more were to be employed, that inconvenience must be stronger felt, and make our merchants trade under such a burden and such a disadvantage that the Dutch would run away with all the profits of the trade of Europe in almost as great a degree as they would engross it in case we were engaged in a war without them. It was said, too, that our naval armaments had been the occasion of so great a fleet being fitted out by France, and of that fleet being kept on the western shore of France, within sight of our coasts, which otherwise would have been sent to Dantzic. It was also strongly insisted upon that the nation was in no condition to bear additional expenses; that if the fatal time should

come when, to prevent the total subversion of the balance of power in Europe, we should be necessitated to take a part in this war, it did behove us not wantonly before that time came to squander our treasure and impair our strength, but to keep ourselves in reserve now, and then exert to the utmost of our power. It was likewise said that the King in his speech, and the Ministers in debate, seemed to speak of the contending Powers accepting our good offices as a thing of great moment, and a promising circumstance; but if the manner in which that acceptation was made by either came to be scanned and set in a true light, that little was to be expected from it but a short amusement for the winter, nor could any but transient and delusive hopes of peace be built on such a foundation. The manner in which France had accepted the good offices of the Maritime Powers was nothing more than by saying she was willing to hear any proposals of accommodation we could make, provided we kept ourselves in such an absolute state of impartiality as enabled us to bear the name of mediators. On the other hand, it was true the Court of Vienna had accepted the good offices, but with an absolute promise that the Emperor was not by that acceptation to be excluded (in case this proposal of accommodation did not succeed) from any right he had by former treaties to receive the succours therein stipulated, and already, in pursuance of those treaties, by him claimed and demanded.

Those on the side of the Court who spoke for the augmentation answered these objections in the following manner:—

In the first place, with regard to no augmentation

having been made by the Dutch since these troubles began, it was said to be no true proposition; for as thirty thousand men are reckoned by Holland a sufficient standing force for the defence of that country in time of peace, so their having fifty-two thousand men now on foot must be reckoned as an augmentation on account of the troubles, especially since everybody knew that after the conclusion of the last Treaty of Vienna the Dutch had determined to make a reduction of twenty-two thousand men in two years—twelve the first and ten the second; and on the breaking out of this war had changed that resolution.

It ought farther, too, the Court party said, to be considered, that though Holland had made no augmentation by sea, yet, as their natural defence was land-forces, as ours was naval armaments, so no parallel ought to be drawn between us and them with regard to an augmentation by sea, but the comparison to be made (if any) between what we were doing by sea and what they actually had done by land.

As to the interests of England and Holland being mutual on this occasion, as urged by those who opposed this augmentation, it was undeniable that they were so; but if two Powers, though in the same interest, were in different circumstances, different measures must be taken by them; and if the English Parliament should declare, or give it to be understood, that they would consent to no step to be taken by England but what was taken by Holland, it would be making the counsels of England so dependent upon those in Holland, that, if any foreign Power had any influence in the counsels of Holland (which often happens in many States), such

a declaration or intimation of the English Parliament would be to assure *that* Power that, provided they could gain Holland, they must govern England, and consequently must tie up our hands as effectually as if England had acceded to the Treaty of Neutrality.

As to the inconvenience the merchants suffered from the scarcity of seamen, it was admitted to be an inconvenience, but one which, for the foregoing reasons and the present circumstances of Europe, was unavoidable, and that, if the armaments of England were not strong by sea, that trade would not only suffer inconveniences, but would be entirely stopped; for as the French and Spanish fleets together did consist of between sixty and seventy ships of the line-of-battle, that is, from 50 to 80 guns, — so, if England had not a naval force ready to make head against such a power, that we must give up the empire of the seas, as well as the balance of power by land, and of course our trade would not only be inconvenienced, but become entirely precarious.

As to our naval armaments last year having been the occasion of those made by France, it was false in fact, those maritime preparations having been made by France, and their fleet fitted out, before ours was ordered or our seamen were voted; and if the consequence of our fleet being fitted out was the prevention of the French fleet leaving the coast of France and sailing to the north, it was a consequence rather to be rejoiced at than regretted, unless any one thought it for the interest of Europe that France should have been as successful at Dantzic as at Philipsburg or in Italy, and that she would be more inclined to peace from having made

greater acquisitions by war, and having nothing but what she was already possessed of to expect from treaty and negotiation.

As to what was said of the little satisfaction it could be to anybody to hear of the good offices being accepted by the contending Powers because no plan of accommodation was very likely to succeed, it was answered that the King himself had in his speech acknowledged the uncertainty there was of success in a negotiation where so many jarring pretensions were to be satisfied and so many conflicting interests to be adjusted; but that it was still reasonable, since a general accommodation was so much to be wished, that people should have some satisfaction in the first step to that desirable end being on all sides submitted to.

It was said, too, by those who argued on this side of the question, that as, in consequence of *the vote of confidence* of last year, there were now twenty-eight thousand seamen actually in pay, so the voting only twenty thousand this year was in reality not only voting against an augmentation, but for an actual and immediate reduction of eight thousand men; and whether in the present conjuncture any reduction of seamen was a proper measure to be taken, was submitted to the consideration of every man in the kingdom, within doors and without.

At last, after a very long debate [*7th February*], the question was put, and thirty thousand seamen were voted by 256 against 183.

On the question for the army there was little more said in the House of Commons than a recapitulation of the

same things that had been thrown out in the debate upon the navy; but though the debate on the land-forces was much colder than that on the fleet, the minority was much stronger; the question on the estimate for twenty-five thousand men for the land-service of this year being carried only by 261 against 208. The only public point, besides these I have already mentioned, that was much contested in the House of Commons this session, was the treaty between the Kings of England and Denmark, by which the latter, in consideration of a subsidy of 80,000*l.* a-year, obliged himself to furnish the former with six thousand men, in case England entered into the war. The old story of the Hessians was revived on this occasion, and the beaten topic of lavish treaty-making ministers again displayed and laboured. However, this subsidy was at last provided for, as well as every other money demand made by the Court; and the measure in general, considering the present situation of Europe, was not thought improper or unreasonable; since, the south being so much in the power of the Triple Alliance, it was judged not impolitic to keep as many of the Princes of the north as we could in another interest, and not leave the Czarina alone in her opposition to the encroachments of France and support of the cause of the House of Austria.

But whilst these State points in the House of Commons went—though contested, yet at last all of them—according to the desire of the Court, it was not so with the election [petitions], the Court not getting above two Members this session upon the balance of that account; and losing several questions on these points that were

most industriously solicited, warmly debated, and strenuously pushed. That which made the defeat of the Court and the triumph of the Opposition more remarkable on these occasions was, that most of these disgraces happened at the bar of the House,[6] and on the debates, that lasted not only several days, but till nine, ten, and eleven o'clock at night. The King, who could never bear with common patience the loss of any question he had a mind to carry, was as much out of humour upon every disappointment of this kind as he could have been on the most important defeat; and the Queen, who liked disappointment in what she had once proposed as little as her consort, though she concealed her mortifications better, was thoroughly dissatisfied, and in private let some expressions escape her which betrayed her being so; and even Sir Robert, which was very rare, did not escape without receiving some tokens of her dissatisfaction, saying that Sir Robert Walpole "either neglected these things, and judged ill enough to think they were trifles, though in Government, and especially in this country, nothing was a trifle; or perhaps," says she, "there is some management I know nothing of, or some circumstances we none of us are acquainted with; but, whatever it is, to me these things seem very ill conducted."

The Marlborough election, though strongly solicited, heard at the bar, and made a point of by the Court, went against the Court, in a very odd manner, and

---

[6] Election petitions were then treated avowedly as mere party questions, and the more important cases were heard at the *bar of the House*. A division on the Chippenham election petition in 1742 was the final blow to Walpole's administration.

without a division. Sir Joseph Jekyll, the Master of the Rolls, who spoke against the Court at twelve o'clock at night, after a hearing and debate of two days, was the occasion of the Court at last giving it up; he started a point of law, on which he said the whole turned, and threw out a defiance to any man who understood the law to contradict him. All the lawyers on the side of the Court were mute; upon which Mr. Pelham pressed Sir Robert Walpole (who yielded to him) not to stand a division; and, as the Attorney and Solicitor General,[7] who did not open their mouths to contradict the Master of the Rolls that night, declared some days after, on examination of their books, that the Master was wrong in his point of law, they caused great confusion and many disputes and complaints among the Court party: everybody blamed the Attorney and Solicitor for their ignorance in not being able to answer the Master on the spot, and for their imprudence, since they had not done it then, for showing afterwards that they might have done it, and for proving the situation of this case to have been like one mentioned in Livy, when he says, "*Non defuit quid responderetur sed deerat qui responsum daret:*"—"that there was wanting not a response, but a respondent."

The bulk of the Court party in the House of Commons, even whilst they thought they were in the wrong in the point of law, were extremely angry that they were not allowed, by a division, to show their zeal against law, which seldom had any weight in the decision of elections: when they heard the law was with

[7] Sir John Willes and Sir Dudley Ryder, both afterwards Chief Justices, the first of the Common Pleas, the latter of the King's Bench.

them, or at least doubtful, they were outrageous. Sir Robert Walpole was angry with Mr. Pelham, whose timidity and affectation of popularity, he said, ever made him in a hurry to drop his friends and cajole his enemies. The Queen, who (at the solicitation of Lord and Lady Hertford,[8] the first one of the Captains of the Horse Guard to the King, the other one of her Ladies of the Bedchamber) had pressed extremely the carrying this election, was very much out of humour when first it miscarried, but more so when she learned in what manner it had been lost. She was displeased with Sir Robert, more so with Mr. Pelham, and most of all with the Master of the Rolls,[9] whom she was always cajoling, always abusing, always hoping to manage, and always finding she was deceived in. He was an impracticable old fellow of four score, with no great natural perspicuity of understanding, and had, instead of enlightening that natural cloud, only gilded it with knowledge,

[8] I cannot reconcile Lord Hervey's statement with that of the *Journals*, where it appears that there was a division, 176 to 172 in favour of the sitting members, one at least of whom, *Mr. Seymour*, would seem to have been the friend of Lord Hertford; and the tellers for the *minority* were certainly strong anti-courtiers.

[9] Pope ironically permits to a courtier satirist

> "A horse laugh, if you please, on honesty;
> A joke on Jekyll, or some odd old Whig
> Who never changed his principles or wig."

To which he adds this note:—

"Sir Joseph Jekyll, a true Whig in his principles, and a man of the utmost probity. He sometimes voted against the Court, which drew upon him the laugh here described of ONE who bestowed it equally on religion and honesty."

None of Pope's annotators attempt to explain this passage. I believe the "ONE" means Queen Caroline, both from the mode of printing the word, and because Lord Hervey (the only other person, I think, that could have been meant) is three or four times distinctly pointed out by name and nickname in the same poem, and would not have been spared in the note.

reading, and learning, and made it more shining, but not less thick: study had made many doubts occur, and solved none; and the desire of appearing in the right, more than the desire of being so, forced him often in Parliament to balance in points where vanity wore the appearance of integrity, and where the bias of popularity drew him against the Court without any other weight to incline him to that side. He was always puzzled and confused in his apprehension of things, more so in forming an opinion upon them, and most of all in his expression and manner of delivering that opinion when it was formed; so that his brain, from a very uncommon formation, was, in conceiving sentiments and forming judgments, like some women, who, instead of plain, natural, and profitable births, are for ever subject to false conceptions and miscarriages, or, if they go out their time, bring a dead offspring or a child turned the wrong way. His principal topics for declamation in the House were generally economy and liberty; and, though no individual in the House ever spoke of him with esteem or respect, but rather with a degree of contempt and ridicule, yet, from his age, and the constant profession of having the public good at heart beyond any other point of view, he had worked himself into such a degree of credit with the accumulated body that he certainly spoke with more general weight, though with less particular approbation, than any other single man in that assembly: and as some people who speak in public, though they have no great respect for the particular people who compose their audience, feel, notwithstanding, an awe for them in their aggregate capacity, so he, without being esteemed by

particulars, had the reverence of the corporate body which those particulars composed.

The balance of the Marlborough election was turned, as well as many other points, merely by his weight being thrown into the anti-Court scale. And there was one odd circumstance that made the Queen think this affair of much more importance, and more mortifying to Sir Robert Walpole, than it really was; for, after Sir Robert, the next day, had been giving her an account of it, Lord Hervey happening to be with her that evening, she told him she never saw anything so managed as this business had been, nor Sir Robert Walpole ever so much struck and cast down on any occasion in her life: "He has just been here," said she, "and appeared quite confounded and moped, had neither life nor spirit, and seemed more shocked (which you know he is not apt to be) than I ever saw any man, and even more than he was at the bustle of the Excise." Lord Hervey, who knew that nothing was so likely to bring Sir Robert into difficulty in the palace as being thought to feel himself in any out of it, told her Majesty that he believed she had misconstrued Sir Robert's confusion, and imputed it to a cause very different from that which had really occasioned it; and then told her Majesty that his mistress, Miss Skerrett, was extremely ill of a pleuritic fever, in great danger, and that Sir Robert was in the utmost anxiety and affliction for her.

The Queen, who was much less concerned about his private afflictions than his ministerial difficulties, was glad to hear his embarrassment thus accounted for, and began to talk on Sir Robert's attachment to this woman, asking Lord Hervey many questions about

Miss Skerrett's beauty and understanding, and his fondness and weakness towards her.[10] She said she was very glad he had any amusement for his leisure hours, but could neither comprehend how a man could be very fond of a woman who was only attached to him for his money, nor ever imagine how any woman would suffer him as a lover from any consideration or inducement but his money. "She must be a clever gentlewoman," continued the Queen, "to have made him believe she cares for him on any other score; and to show you what fools we all are in some point or other, she has certainly told him some fine story or other of her love and her passion, and that poor man—*avec ce gros corps, ces jambes enflées, et ce vilain ventre*—believes her. Ah! what is human nature!" While she was saying this, she little reflected in what degree she herself possessed all the impediments and antidotes to love she had been enumerating, and that "*Ah! what is human nature!*" was as applicable to her own blindness as to his.

However, her manner of speaking of Sir Robert on this occasion showed at least that he was not just at this time in the same rank of favour with her that he used to be; for though she might not always before have been blind to these defects and these weaknesses, at least she had been so indulgent to them as to have been always dumb upon that chapter, and to let these things escape her communicated reflections, if they had not escaped her private observation.

---

[10] This passage satisfies me that the original annotator of Lady Mary W. Montagu, as well as Lord Wharncliffe, who followed him, were mistaken in describing Miss Skerrett as one of the Queen's maids of honour. See *ante*, p. 115.

The petition of the Scotch Peers, which had been so long expected, and often said to be dropped, was at last [on the 13*th February*] presented by the Duke of Bedford, and conceived in the following terms:—

"To the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, &c.

"The humble petition of James Duke of Hamilton and Brandon, Charles Duke of Queensberry and Dover, James Duke of Montrose, Thomas Earl of Dundonald, Alexander Earl of Marchmont, and John Earl of Stair, sheweth

"That at the last election of sixteen peers to serve in the present Parliament for that part of Great Britain called Scotland, the majority of votes was obtained for the Duke of Buccleuch, &c.—who were returned accordingly.

"Your petitioners, however, conceive it their duty to represent to your Lordships, that several undue methods and illegal practices were used towards carrying on this election, and towards engaging Peers to vote for a list of Peers to represent the Peerage of Scotland, such as are inconsistent with the freedom of Parliaments, dishonourable to the Peerage, contrary to the design and intention of those laws that direct the election of sixteen Peers for that part of Great Britain called Scotland, and such as may prove subversive of our happy constitution; instances and proofs whereof we are able to lay before your Lordships in such manner as your Lordships shall direct.

"Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Lordships will be pleased to take this important affair into your most serious consideration, to allow those instances and proofs to be laid before you, and to do therein as in your great wisdoms shall seem most proper to maintain the dignity of the Peerage and the freedom of the election of the Peers for that part of Great Britain called Scotland, and to preserve the constitution and independency of Parliaments."

As soon as this petition had been read, the Duke of Bedford moved the House, *that the petitioners should*

be appointed to prove the allegations of it that day month.

This motion was opposed by the Lord Chancellor, who said the House was not ripe for such a resolution, and moved that the petition might be taken into consideration on that day se'nnight, which after a short debate was agreed to without a division.

When the day for taking the petition into consideration [*20th February*] was come, Lord Hardwicke, after a very long, well-studied, and well-digested speech, moved the House to order the Lords petitioners to declare whether they meant by this petition to controvert the seats of the sixteen sitting Lords; to which the Duke of Bedford answered by pulling a paper out of his pocket and reading it to the House, the purport of which was to acquaint the House that he was empowered by the Lords petitioners to declare they did not mean to dispute the seats of the sitting sixteen, nor any one of them.

It was said that the House could not, consistently with its usual and proper forms, receive this oral declaration of the Duke of Bedford as authentic, though every one Lord was far from doubting his having full authority for what he had said. But as the petition was in writing, and signed, so any explanation of it must come the same way. The further consideration therefore of this affair was adjourned to the next day [on a division of 90 to 51], and the Lord Chancellor was ordered in the mean time to write to the Lords petitioners for this explanation, to be given in to the House in the proper form, which was in writing, and signed.

The next day the petitioners sent this declaration of not contesting the seats of the sixteen, nor any one of them, in the form prescribed.

Then the Duke of Devonshire moved the House that the Lords petitioners might be directed to lay before the House *the instances of those undue methods and illegal practices complained of in their petition, and the names of those persons by whom they had been practised.*

There was a long debate on this question; those against the question representing the difficulties under which it would put the Lords petitioners; and those who supported the question saying it was inconsistent with all natural justice and the practice of all courts of justice whatsoever (except the Inquisition) to hear a cause *ex parte*, and to suffer evidence to be brought against any person in a criminal prosecution without that person having notice of such accusation, and being allowed, at the same time that evidence was brought to accuse him, to bring evidence likewise for his defence.

The question was at last carried by a great majority [90 to 48].

The answer of the Lords petitioners was very long and evasive; naming but one fact, which was that of the regiment[11] being drawn out on the day of election, and without naming one person. The reason they gave for their non-compliance with the orders was the

---

11 "That on the day of election a battalion of Hall's forces was drawn up in the Abbey court of Edinburgh, and three companies of it were marched from Leith (a place one mile distant) to join the rest of the battalion, and kept under arms from nine in the morning to nine at night, without any cause or occasion that your petitioners could foresee other than the overawing the election."—*Hist. Reg.* 1736, 115.

impossibility of complying without becoming accusers, which they declared they never designed to be.

Upon this answer being read, Lord Cholmondeley moved the House to come to the following resolution: *That the petitioners have not complied with the order of this House, by which they were directed to name the facts of which they complained, and by whom those facts were committed.*

There was a debate on this question, but it passed at last by a great majority [90 to 47].

The moment after this division Lord Hervey got up and made a speech[12] and motion that "*the petition be dismissed.*"

Accordingly the petition was dismissed; and in this manner ended an affair that was grown at last almost as troublesome to those who prosecuted it as it had been at first to those whom it was undertaken to distress; the people in opposition being divided in their opinions and sentiments upon it, and the scent lying very cold by which they were to trace the Administration through the dirty roads that lead to Scotch elections, but where it was as hard to follow them as it would be for strangers to pursue any of the inhabitants of that charming country into their own Highlands.

The King and Queen acted on this occasion as their custom was on many others—that is, by treating the danger of this ruffle, after it was over, with a sort of Falstaff bravery, and pretending always to have despised the kindling of this flame as much as they now did

---

12 Which I insert at length [in the Appendix], to illustrate the whole progress of this affair from commencement of it to its determination.—LORD HERVEY.

its ashes; but of the apprehensions they were in whilst this business was depending I was often both an eye and ear witness, though they spoke of it afterward even to me in a way that looked as if they imagined my memory must be as bad as they wished it, and that it was as impossible for me to reflect on what I had seen and heard as it would have been impolitic and impolite to have mentioned it; or perhaps they did in this occurrence what princes are very apt to do, which is, concluding those courtiers who are politically dumb to be naturally deaf and blind: yet in the morning before this petition was to be presented, the Queen was so anxious to know what was said, thought, done, or expected on this occasion, that she sent for Lord Hervey whilst she was in bed; and because it was contrary to the queenly etiquette to admit a man to her bedside whilst she was in it, she kept him talking on one side of the door which opened just upon her bed whilst she conversed with him on the other for two hours together, and then sent him to the King's side[13] to repeat to his Majesty all he had related to her.

When the question of the troops came to be debated in the House of Lords [13*th March*], the objections made to this augmentation were much the same, in all the strong parts of them, as those that had been urged in the House of Commons. Lord Strafford,[14] a loquacious, rich, illiterate, cold, tedious, constant haranguer

[13] The King's or Queen's separate apartments were called the *King's* or *Queen's* "SIDE."

[14] Thomas Wentworth, first Lord Strafford of the second creation. He had been ambassador to Russia and Holland, and was one of the plenipotentiaries at the Treaty of Utrecht. He died in 1739.

in the House of Lords, who neither spoke sense nor English, and always gave an anniversary declamation on this subject, went upon the trite topic of the danger of standing armies to a free state, and knew as little how to adapt his arguments to the particular circumstances, or the times, or the particular temper of his audience, as he did how to give a proper pronunciation to the few words he was master of, or proper words to the few things that came within the narrow limits of his Lordship's knowledge: in short, there was nothing so low as his dialect except his understanding, nor anything so tiresome as his public harangues except his private conversations. There was but one Ciceronian quality (vanity excepted) which I ever discovered in this orator, and that was, that the one did not oftener weave into his orations the history of his consulship and Catiline's conspiracy, than the other introduced some account of his embassy in Holland at the time of the Treaty of Utrecht, when he had the double honour of being a very dirty executor of a very dirty errand.

The motion for altering the number of forces for the service of this year from twenty-five thousand to eighteen thousand men was made by this ingenious Lord —*digna causa meliore puero*; nor did the cause want good advocates though it had no better a propounder, for Lord Carteret and Lord Chesterfield spoke excellently well in support of this question; and though they only made use of arguments that had already been urged in the House of Commons, yet the one advanced them with so much strength, knowledge, and eloquence, the other with so much wit, satire, and ingenuity, and both with so much applause and popularity, that each

of them in their different style, even without that great charm of novelty, gained credit, and spoke almost as much to the satisfaction of their audience on this occasion as they ever did on all occasions to their own.

I wish I had copies of their speeches to insert here;[15] but as I have not, I can only give [in the Appendix] what was said in answer to them by Lord Hervey, who closed the debate.

After this, the question was put and the greater number of forces voted by a majority of two, yet I cannot help confessing that a more unreasonable vote, in my humble opinion, was never passed—as that short argument of these troops being too many if England was not to be engaged in the war, and too few if she was, seems to me unanswerable; I am sure at least it was unanswered.[16]

But the true reason for taking this measure was, that Sir Robert Walpole, who would willingly have spared himself both the unpopularity of keeping up so large a body of forces, and the trouble of finding money to defray so great and unnecessary an expense, was obliged to give in to this measure in order to flatter the military genius of the King, who was always as insatiably covetous of troops as money, thought he could never have enough of either, and could seldom be prevailed with

[15] In the 'Parliamentary History' the several speeches are lumped together into one argument on each side.

[16] Lord Hervey is here unjust to his own side: common sense points out that an amount of force not equal to all the exigencies of eventual hostilities might yet be a very cogent argument towards the preservation of peace, and a very important preparative for war. But Lord Hervey thus disparages his own success, either from his own *hereditary* antipathy to standing armies, or in compliance with Sir R. Walpole's pacific policy, or perhaps from the motive stated *ante*, p. 301, n. 3.

to part with either, though he had more of both than he had any occasion to employ, or any use for farther than to review the one and count the other; and as his Majesty was vehemently for taking a part in this war, his Minister had no way of keeping him out of it but by this composition, which was the putting the means of war into his hands at the same time that he tied them up from using them, and giving his Majesty the satisfaction of brandishing a sword in the scabbard which he would not permit him to draw.

In this manner was this great and able statesman often obliged to purchase great points by yielding in small ones, and of course incurred the imputation of acting injudiciously in things which, abstractedly considered, he certainly could not justify, but, weighed with their connection to other matters which he could not have brought about but upon these conditions, were so far from being any reflection on his conduct, that they were proofs of his skill; and if men may now and then be allowed in policy to deviate a little from that injunction in the Gospel of not doing evil that good may come of it, there was hardly any measure ever taken with regard to the army (excepting that number of troops raised by his timidity the election-year) which I do not think I could account for without Sir Robert Walpole's being really to blame.

There was one negative circumstance which favoured his endeavours to prevent the King and Queen involving England this year in the war which I must not omit to relate, and that was M. Hatolf's being so ill all winter that he could not once come to the Queen to blow that militant flame in her Majesty which Sir Ro-

bert, with all the political buckets he was continually throwing upon it, could never quite extinguish, though he kept it from blazing out in the vehement manner she wished to let it rage.

The expenses for the current service of this year, even without going into the war, were very great, amounting to no less than 3,250,000*l.* :—

Land-tax at 2*s.* in the pound . .	£1,000,000
The Sinking Fund . . .	1,000,000
Malt-tax	750,000
Borrowed on the salt-duty . .	500,000
	£3,250,000

Which sum, added to 2,000,000*l.* that went to the payment of the interest of the National Debt, and including also the revenue of the King's Civil List, reckoned at but 800,000*l.*, together with 1,500,000*l.* at least raised by the poor's tax, makes 7,550,000*l.*[17] which was raised this year by this poor, indigent, undone nation (as I hear it every day called) for the annual services. Not that I would be thought by what I am saying to approve the conduct of those who make this country in time of peace pay these vast sums for its annual support, any more than I do the nonsense of those either ignorant or hypocritical lamenters who talk of our being

[17] Current Service . . . £3,250,000
Interest of National Debt . 2,000,000
Civil List 800,000
Poor's Tax 1,500,000
£7,550,000.—*Lord Hervey.*

Lord Hervey's mode of stating this account is not precisely accurate, and he confuses a little the *Supply* and the *Ways and Means*; but the result is substantially correct: the *Supply* was 3,150,452*l.*

ruined: I think the practice of the one as false policy as I think the assertions of the other false theory; for if this country in all its prosperity, and after five-and-twenty years' peace, is but two millions in fifty less in debt than it was at the determination of Queen Anne's war, I cannot but acknowledge that to my weak understanding the economy of the Government in its domestic calling does not seem to me to have been very laudably exercised; nor do I at all approve the situation which, according to this way of acting (if continued), this nation must ever be in, and that is, that in time of war its debts are always to be increased, and in time of peace never to be lessened.

To look, therefore, upon the situation of England at present in a true light, at least as I conceive its situation to be, and to reduce it to the parallel circumstances of a single private person (which kind of familiar instances tend always to illustrate these sort of cases), I consider England in its present circumstances not in the least as a necessitous bankrupt who has neither money enough to pay his creditors nor to provide for his own subsistence, as it is represented by the ignorant, the irritating, and the clamorous, to serve private ends and gratify personal pique—but I look upon England at present as a man in vast affluence, who inherits and possesses a large estate chargeable with a great debt, and tenant for life only in that estate, without a power to raise more money, or very little more, upon it than that with which it already stands charged; and though this estate yields him a produce sufficient to pay the interest of that debt, and to live in great ease, magnificence, credit, and expense at the same time, yet, as his con-

stant way of living calls for the whole surplus of his revenue after the interest of the debt is paid, so, in case of any exigence or contingent call for any sum of money, I look upon him under an absolute incapacity of providing for such wants without either retrenching his former expenses in some article, or making himself extremely uneasy as long as he lives; and as it is full as improbable that any country should for ever be in a condition that will not call for greater expenses than are necessary in a state of profound peace as it is to suppose that many generations should follow one another without some demands upon their estates of the nature of those I have enumerated, so I hold it to be very bad economy and the highest imprudence for any government to persist in keeping up its expenses to the full stretch of its purse in those seasons when it ought to be discharging the debts contracted by former extravagances, and providing for the charge of future necessities. Yet this imprudence is indisputably our case at present, since, as far as I am master of the state of our debts and expenses of our annual disbursements, and our power to augment the revenue, I do not see how it would be possible, on any exigence, or for the support of the most necessary war, for England to raise above 1,000,000*l.* a-year more than it now raises,[18] which would be by increasing the land-tax from 2*s.* to 4*s.* in the pound.

And there is one circumstance that reflects very

---

[18] What would my father have said had he lived to these days, 1777, and seen *seventeen millions* raised in a year?—*Note by the third Earl.*

What would either have said to our raising for 1846, a year of peace, *fifty-three millions?*

strongly on the economy of our present governors, which, as I am determined to give my opinion impartially on every subject treated in these papers, I will not pass over in silence; and that is, that the nation now annually pays more for the current service of the year, without being engaged in the present war, than it did during the first two or three years when it was a principal in King William's and Queen Anne's wars.

I, therefore, am far from justifying the *prudential* part of taking the Sinking Fund for the current service in the manner it has lately been done, though I have, both in public and private, justified *the legality of it.*

The public has certainly a right to dispose of those surpluses called the Sinking Fund, after the interest of the national debt is paid, in what manner the public thinks fit, as those surpluses are, by the words of the Acts of Parliament which constitute the contract between the public and the creditors of the public, absolutely and explicitly reserved for the future disposition of Parliament; and when the clause in one of those Acts, called the General Fund Act, does dispose of these surpluses as fast as they arise for the payment of part of the principal of the national debts incurred before the year 1716, it is very evident that the Parliament in that case acts as a steward for the public, and not as a contractor for the public; that its acts are consequently only declaratory and prudential for itself, not obligatory and binding upon future Parliaments; and can no more be construed to tie down future Parliaments than any other Act made by Parliament, which is merely discretionary, not bargaining, and consequently revoc-

able, alterable, and rescindable by any future Parliament.[19]

At the end of this Session of Parliament the Scripture parable was reversed; for the harvest of Court favours was small and the labourers were many, there being many Lords and Commoners who were very desirous to reap those favours, and but two employments to be disposed of—that of Privy Seal, vacated by the resignation of Lord Lonsdale, and that of Secretary-at-War, that became void by the dismission of Sir William Strickland, who had already kept the office above a year longer than he was capable of doing the duty of it, and was now become so weak in mind as well as body, that his head was as much in its second infancy as his limbs.[20]

Lord Lonsdale,[21] when he resigned the Privy Seal, declared, not only to the King but to everybody else, that he quitted from no personal disgust either to his Master or his Ministers, nor any disapprobation either of their foreign or domestic measures; but merely on account of his health and his natural love for retirement, both which made him equally unfit for living in town or about a Court. He was a speculative, splenetic, honest man, who always wanted to make practice tally with theory, and, as he was out of humour with the world when he could not, I need not add that he was seldom pleased; and, as melancholy people who study

---

[19] See Lord Carteret's and Lord Hervey's speeches on the Sinking Fund.—*Note by Lord Hervey.*

[20] The fourth baronet. He died 1st September, 1735, shortly after his resignation, at the age, the Baronetage says, of only forty-nine.

[21] See *ante*, p. 228, Horace Walpole's character of him.

books of physic and anatomy are apt to fancy they have every distemper they read of, and that their own body, from the delicacy of its texture, is in danger of falling to pieces every time they stir a leg or an arm, so this theoretic Lord, from a natural gloom in his temper that made him see everything in a much deeper shade than cheerful eyes would ever have beheld them, in ruminating on the corruption of the present times, and the disaffection of the nation to the present Royal Family, used to foresee nothing but tumults, seditions, insurrections, rebellions, revolutions; and would often say to those who were in his confidence, that, as it was impossible for things long to hold together upon the foot they now were, and that approaching confusion must soon be the lot of his poor unfortunate country, so he desired to retire out of a world which he was unable to mend, unfit to bustle in, and unwilling to see torn to pieces; adding, on these occasions, that England was brought to the dilemma of being undone by the expenses of war, if it took that part; or by the turbulence of faction, luxury, and corruption, if it remained in the inactivity of peace. These reflections, he said, joined to very ill health, made him so unhappy whilst he remained a near spectator of these impending misfortunes, that he was determined to go abroad, in order to mend the one and to remove the disagreeable prospect of the other, and, accordingly, soon after he went into the south of France. His brother,[22] too, who very

[22] The Honourable Anthony Lowther, younger brother of Lord Lonsdale (whom he predeceased), a commissioner of Irish revenue, and a man of fashionable celebrity in his day. The Monimia and Philocles of Lord Hervey's poetical epistle were the unfortunate Sophia Howe, maid of honour to the Princess, and Anthony—or, as he was familiarly called, Nanty—Lowther.

unreasonably thought his merit superior to an employment of 1000*l.* a-year in Ireland, and for that reason quitted it, contributed to strengthen these opinions, hoping that his brother's dislike of things would grow into a dislike of persons, and that he should blow him up to be an enemy to those whom his own vanity had induced him to think had not been enough his friends.

Lord Lonsdale's employment was given immediately to Lord Godolphin—not from a desire in the King to show him favour, but from a principle of economy; for by this means the King saved a pension of 3000*l.* a-year, which Lord Godolphin had enjoyed ever since he quitted the employment of Groom of the Stole.

Sir William Yonge was made Secretary-at-War, which left a vacancy in the Treasury. Lord Hervey pressed Sir Robert Walpole extremely to put his friend Mr. Winnington[23] into this vacancy, which would have

---

[23] Thomas Winnington, successively a Lord of the Admiralty and Treasury-Cofferer, and lastly Paymaster, in which, on his death in 1746, he was succeeded by Mr. Pitt. He was very clever, and very amiable, though versatile and inconsistent in politics. Horace Walpole, in a letter of 25th April, 1746, announcing his death, says of him—"He was one of the first men in England from his parts and his employment. I was familiarly acquainted with him; loved and admired him, for he had great good nature, and a quickness of wit most peculiar to himself; and, for his public talents, he has left nobody equal to him, as before nobody was superior to him but my father."—*Letters*, ii. 118. In his Memoirs, however, he adds to a similar eulogium a little alloy:—"His jolly way of laughing at his own want of principle revolted the graver sort of politicians. He had infinitely more wit than any man I ever knew, and it was as ready and quick as it was constant and unpremeditated. His style was a little brutal; his courage not at all so; his good humour was inexhaustible; it was impossible to hate or to hurt him."—*Mem. Geo. II.*, i. 151. He was a dear friend of Lord Hervey and Henry Fox; as well as of Sir C. H. Williams, whose epitaph on Winnington is his best and indeed only good serious verses:—

"Near his paternal seat here buried lies
The grave, the gay, the witty, and the wise;

Form'd

made one in the Admiralty, where Mr. Campbell,[24] another of his friends, would of course have come in. The Duke of Newcastle and Mr. Pelham solicited the Treasury for Mr. Clutterbuck;[25] and Sir Robert Walpole, not caring to decide between these two, put in neither, which, in my opinion, was at this time one of the most impolitic unministerial acts I ever knew him guilty of.

Winnington's pretensions were certainly superior every way to Clutterbuck's; he was his senior in the Admiralty, and besides that, was, from his party-knowledge and application, of infinite use to Sir Robert Walpole in the House of Commons. Clutterbuck was sensible, beloved, and had a good character, but was lazy, indolent, and mute, and of no use in Parliament but counting one in a division.

The way that Sir Robert Walpole took to avoid disobliging one of these two men disobliged them both, for he took his son-in-law, Lord Cholmondeley, into the Treasury; and though neither of them could complain of Lord Cholmondeley's being preferred to them, yet

---

Form'd for all parts, in all alike he shined;
Variously great—a genius unconfined—
In converse bright, judicious in debate,
In private amiable, in public great," &c.

Williams's Works, ii. 83.

Mr. Winnington was but just fifty when he died, or was killed, as Walpole says, by the ignorance of Dr. Thompson.

[24] John Campbell of Cawdor, M.P. for Pembrokeshire, successively a Lord of the Admiralty, 1736, and of the Treasury in 1746. He was grandfather of the first Lord Cawdor.

[25] Thomas Clutterbuck, Esq., had been secretary to Lord Carteret as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, became a Lord of the Admiralty in May, 1732, in which office he remained till, in May, 1742, he was made Treasurer of the Navy, but died shortly after. He married, in 1731, the only sister of the third Earl of Dysart, who himself married the eldest daughter of Lord Carteret.

both of them saw he was put there only to avoid a decision between their claims.

The reason Sir Robert gave for putting Lord Cholmondeley there was, that his Lordship was so uneasy in the Prince's service, and had so long pressed him to be removed out of it, that it was impossible for him longer to withstand that solicitation, especially since it was upon his account Lord Cholmondeley was so ill used by the Prince; nor could he, with any decency to the Prince, take Lord Cholmondeley out of his service upon any pretence but that of putting him into a place of business; for which reason, when the King had offered to make Lord Cholmondeley a Lord of his Bedchamber, Lord Cholmondeley had declined it. By this odd measure, therefore, of putting Lord Cholmondeley into the Treasury, the Prince was disobliged, by Lord Cholmondeley quitting his service; the King was disobliged, because he had declined the Bedchamber; Mr. Winnington and Mr. Clutterbuck were disobliged, because their hopes of the Treasury were defeated; and Campbell was disobliged, because, after ten years' service, an opportunity of providing for him offered and was not taken.

Lord Hervey remonstrated to Sir Robert Walpole against this step, for all these accumulated reasons; adding, that Sir Robert was always feeling the weight of all the young men in the House of Commons taking a part against him, and yet on every occasion showed that they could get nothing by being attached to him. Sir Robert said that it was not his fault that there were not more things in his gift. To which Lord Hervey answered, that was very true; but it was a fault, not

only to his friends but even to himself, if he did not make the best disposition he could of those favours that were in his power; and added further, that, let him be ever so able a Minister, it was impossible for him to alter universal principles in human nature, and the fundamental inducements of mankind not only to serve one another but even to serve Heaven itself; that the strength of all government, like the foundation of all religions, was rewards and punishments; and that the one was as necessary to encourage one's friends and keep them firm, as the other was to intimidate one's enemies and keep them quiet. "But, Sir," continued he, "if I may take the liberty to say so, you are at present breaking through both these rules by showing the world that your known and almost avowed enemies may be your enemies with impunity, and enjoy the best employments in the kingdom; whilst your friends have nothing to reward them but that unpopularity which always attends serving power, without the profit that should be annexed to it; and if Mr. Campbell and Mr. Fox,[26] after serving you seven years for that disagreeable *Leah*, are to serve you seven more for *Rachel*, who, among the youth that has his senses, if he thinks of his interest (and I believe you have lived too long in the world and in power to expect people should embark in any party without thinking of it), will ever list in your service with such a prospect and such examples before their eyes?"

[26] Stephen Fox, afterwards Lord Ilchester; who seems from Lord Hervey's private letters to have been the nearest and dearest friend he ever had. The younger brother, Henry Fox, afterwards Lord Holland, was also a very great friend.

Sir Robert said all this was very true, but that Lord Hervey knew he had always declared Mr. Campbell and Mr. Fox should be the two first people he would provide for; that he thought them not only useful but creditable friends, as their integrity was not inferior to their understandings, nor their characters to their fortunes. "But, my Lord, you see my difficulty: Campbell could not be brought into the Admiralty without Winnington or Clutterbuck being removed, and one of those could not be removed without the other being lost. I am inclined to Winnington, but you know I am the only friend (yourself excepted) he has in the Court, and that both the King and Queen have great prejudices against him."

"One of these things," replied Lord Hervey, "is the consequence of the other: he has no friend in the palace but you, because he has attached himself to nobody but you; and the people who are angry he has made court only to you are those who have given the King and Queen those prejudices against him; so that I think you in honour and justice, and indeed in interest (unless you will let people know it is not safe to attach themselves wholly to you), bound to remove any ill impressions that may have been given of Winnington at Court, since you must know that their being made so strong has proceeded chiefly from his being so strongly and undividedly your humble servant." "As to what you said" (interrupted Sir Robert Walpole) "about my enemies being such with impunity, I have told Dodington this very morning that I will no longer bear his shuffling, fast-and-loose conduct, and will rather risk the entering into the next Session of Parliament

with a majority only of forty or fifty than go on in this way; I desired, therefore, we might understand one another, and he has, with the greatest submission, promised everything I could require with regard to his future good behaviour. As for the Duke of Dorset, I have got the Queen at last to consent to remove him from his Lieutenancy in Ireland: Lord Scarborough I design should succeed him, and your friend Mr. Fox, if he likes it, shall go Secretary; but though I commission you to propose this to him, it is under the injunction of the strictest secrecy, for neither the Duke of Dorset yet knows he is to quit this employment, nor Lord Scarborough that he is to have it."

Sir Robert Walpole, in order to raise the value to Lord Hervey of what he had cut out for his friend Mr. Fox, told him the employment of Secretary was worth 2000*l.* a-year, which it was not by near the half. However, nothing else offering, Lord Hervey advised Mr. Fox to accept it, and he did so; but when the offer of the Lieutenancy was made to Lord Scarborough, to the great surprise of Sir Robert Walpole, as well as of the King and Queen, he refused it; acknowledging, at the same time, great obligations for the honour they had done him in offering it; but saying it was impossible he could expose his character to the censure of the world so far as to give any handle for a suspicion or insinuation that he had quitted his employment one year only in order to get a more profitable one the next.

But what was more extraordinary still than Lord Scarborough's refusal of this great post, was that it never took air that the offer of it had been made to him; and the Duke of Dorset went to Ireland again

as satisfied with his own security as if he had owed it to his own strength.

Sir Robert Walpole took a little ill the strong manner in which Lord Hervey had pressed Mr. Winnington and Mr. Campbell's advancement on this occasion; and Lord Hervey certainly went much farther than he would have done had he known, as he did afterwards, that the measure of putting Lord Cholmondeley into the Treasury was at that time unalterably resolved upon.

Winnington's rough behaviour to Sir Robert Walpole on the disappointment did Lord Hervey, who had appeared so zealous for him, still more hurt, and himself no good. Mr. Clutterbuck's resentment went so far that he absented himself entirely from Sir Robert Walpole; and Winnington was going on in the same simple middle way with Mr. Clutterbuck—that is, voting in public with Sir Robert, and talking in private against him—when Lord Hervey insisted on his making the option of either quitting his employment and being thoroughly disobliged, or keeping it and being thoroughly reconciled. He advised the last, and his advice was followed.

This being the third summer since the King's last journey to Hanover, and this triennial journey one among the many things which the King continued to do because he had once done them, his Majesty declared, a little before the Parliament rose, his intention of visiting, as soon as it should rise, his foreign dominions. His Ministers in England were one and all extremely desirous to divert his Majesty from this resolution, but did not succeed. It is certain it would have been

much for the despatch as well as for the convenience of foreign negotiations, which were likely to be the chief business of this summer, that the King should have remained in England, in order to prevent every paper, which in that case might be regulated by a short journey only from Sir Robert Walpole's house at Chelsea to the King's palace at Kensington, being obliged to make a voyage or two from England to Hanover before it could be settled. Neither would it have been a very agreeable incident for the King of Great Britain, after a month's residence at Hanover, to be running back again through Westphalia to England with seventy thousand Prussians at his heels; and yet, considering the terms he and the King of Prussia were upon at present, this might easily have happened, and was suggested by Sir Robert Walpole to deter his Majesty from this expedition; but to their remonstrances his Majesty always answered, "Pooh!" and "Stuff!" or, "You think to get the better of me, but you shall not;" and, in short, plainly showed that all efforts to divert him from this expedition would be fruitless.

The English Ministers apprehended, too, that if the King went into Germany, his German Ministers, being all of them Imperialists, might make the difficulties of keeping his Majesty out of the war, in case the proposition for peace did not take place, still more troublesome and harder to be surmounted than they had hitherto found them, which might be of fatal consequence when the English Ministers, by experience, knew their influence was barely a match for such difficulties even in their former degree, and combated on this side of the water.

But that which prevented the English Ministers from succeeding in their attempts to prevent his Majesty's intended journey, in my opinion, was the Queen, through whom they chiefly worked, not being heartily desirous they should succeed—not that her Majesty could not foresee some inconveniences in his going, but the danger of blowing up his warlike disposition, which was one of the things that alarmed our Ministers the most, disturbed her the least; and to compensate the trouble of transacting all business with him at that distance by letter, she had the pleasure that resulted to her pride from the *éclat* of the regency, and the convenience and ease of being mistress of all those hours that were not employed in writing, to do what she pleased, which was never her case for two hours together when the King was in England; and besides these *agrémens*, she had the certainty of being, for six months at least, not only free from the fatigue of being obliged to entertain him twenty hours in the twenty-four, but also from the more irksome office of being set up to receive the quotidian sallies of a temper that, let it be charged by what hand it would, used always to discharge its hottest fire, on some pretence or other, upon her.

But there was one trouble arose on the King's going to Hanover which her Majesty did not at all foresee, which was his becoming, soon after his arrival, so much attached to one Madame Walmoden,[27] a young married woman of the first fashion at Hanover, that nobody in England talked of anything but the declining power

[27] Amelia Sophia de Walmoden, created, after Queen Caroline's death, Countess of Yarmouth. She died in 1765. Lord Hervey always calls her either *Walmoude* or *Valmoude*. I have everywhere restored the real name.

of the Queen, and the growing interest of this new favourite. By what I could perceive of the Queen, I think her pride was much more hurt on this occasion than her affections, and that she was much more uneasy from thinking people imagined her interest declining than from apprehending it was so.

It is certain, too, that, from the very beginning of this new engagement, the King acquainted the Queen by letter of every step he took in it—of the growth of his passion, the progress of his applications, and their success—of every word as well as every action that passed—so minute a description of her person, that had the Queen been a painter she might have drawn her rival's picture at six hundred miles' distance.[28] He

[28] These strange confidences are also stated by Horace Walpole:—"Madame Walmoden was the King's mistress at Hanover during his latter journeys, and with the Queen's privity; for *he always made her the confidante of his amours;* which made Mrs. Selwyn (bedchamber-woman, mother of the famous George, and herself of much vivacity, and pretty, p. 73) once tell him that he should be the last man with whom she would have an intrigue, as she knew he would tell the Queen. In his letters from Hanover he said to her, 'You must love the Walmoden, for she loves *me.*'"—*Reminiscences*, 96. In Lord Campbell's Life of Lord Chancellor King we find another corroboration of these incredible confessions. Lord King notes that he dined with Sir Robert:—"On this occasion he let me into several secrets relating to the King and Queen—that the King constantly wrote to her long letters of two or three sheets, being generally of all his actions, what he did every day, even to minute things, and particularly of his amours, what women he admired * * * and that the Queen, to continue him in a disposition to do what she desired, returned as long letters, and approved even of his amours; not scrupling to say that she was but one woman and an old woman, and that he might love more and younger women * * * by which perfect subserviency to his will, she effected whatever she desired, without which it was impossible to keep him in bounds."—*Lives of the Chancellors*, iv. 633. Lord Campbell says he has put asterisks in lieu of "*expressions imputed to her Majesty too coarse to be copied,*" and he adds a very natural doubt whether the whole of this strange story was not "a fiction of Walpole's over his wine to mystify the Chancellor;" but the concurrent and still more detailed evidence of Lord Hervey unfortunately puts these scandalous transactions beyond all doubt.

added, too, the account of his buying her, and what he gave her, which, considering the rank of the purchaser, and the merits of the purchase as he set them forth, I think he had no great reason to brag of, when the first price, according to his report, was only one thousand ducats—a much greater proof of his economy than his passion.

But notwithstanding all the Queen's philosophy on this occasion, when she found the time for the King's return put off so late in the year that for six weeks together the orders for the yacht were by every post and courier in vain expected, she grew extremely uneasy; and, by the joy she showed when the orders arrived, plainly manifested that she had felt more anxiety than she had suffered to appear whilst they were deferred.

Yet all this while the King, besides his ordinary letters by the post, never failed sending a courier once a-week with a letter of sometimes *sixty pages*, and *never less than forty*, filled with an hourly account of everything he saw, heard, thought, or did, and crammed with minute trifling circumstances, not only unworthy of a man to write, but even of a woman to read, most of which I saw, and almost all of them heard reported by Sir Robert, to whose perusal few were not committed, and many passages in them were transmitted to him by the King's own order, who used to tag several paragraphs with "*Montrez ceci et consultez là-dessus le gros homme.*" Among many extraordinary things and expressions these letters contained, there was one in which he desired the Queen to contrive, if she could, that the Prince of Modena, who was to come the latter end of the year to England, might bring his wife with

him;[29] and the reason he gave for it was, that he heard her Highness was pretty free of her person, and that he had the greatest inclination imaginable to pay his addresses to a daughter of the late Regent of France, the Duke of Orleans—"*un plaisir*" (for he always wrote in French) "*que je suis sûr, ma chère Caroline, vous serez bien aise de me procurer, quand je vous dis combien je le souhaite.*"

Such a request to his wife respecting a woman he never saw, and during his connection with Madame Walmoden, speaks much stronger in a bare narrative of the fact than by any comment or reflections; and is as incapable of being heightened as difficult to be credited.

[*During the summer Lord Hervey made a visit to some friends in the West, and wrote to the Queen the following fanciful account of his tour, which I introduce here to show the terms on which he was with her Majesty, and as a prelude to some pleasantries of the same class which we shall see presently.*]

TO THE QUEEN.

THOROUGHLY sensible of all the gracious distinctions and innumerable favours with which your Majesty honoured me when I was alive, I thought it my duty to give your Majesty some notice of my death. On Saturday the 14th June, about five minutes after eleven, I died. Some malicious people per-

---

[29] Francis d'Esté, hereditary Prince of Modena, married, in 1720, Charlotte Aglaï, younger daughter of the Regent Duke of Orleans. The accounts we read of the morals of the lady's family are almost incredible, but not more so than the shameful anecdote recorded in the text, of which not the least wonderful part is the Queen's communicating such a monstrous proposal to Lord Hervey—which, without the corroborating evidence of Lord King and Horace Walpole as to similar confidences, we should hardly venture to credit.

haps may give out that I died drunk; for as I departed this life just as I took leave of your Majesty when you retired out of your gallery, I cannot deny but that I expired with a drop in my eye. The next morning my corpse was carried down to Salisbury, where Bishop Sherlock of that diocese read the funeral service over me; from thence the body was carried to Mr. Fox's[30] and there privately interred; it had not rested there a week, when my poor carcase was taken up again and conveyed to lie in state at the family seat of Lord Poulet; my body was there exhibited to the view of all the country, and, according to the custom of Italy, in the same dress I wore when I was alive. My Lord Poulet himself was *the undertaker*, and the obsequies were performed (though far in the West) with all the pomp and magnificence of the East: the bed on which the body of the defunct was laid was velvet, laced with gold, adorned with plumes of feathers; the staircase by which all those who were admitted to see my body ascended, was vaulted with lapis-lazuli; they passed through five large rooms before they came to my mausoleum; near thirty men in the same livery were perpetually watching the corpse, and prayers were read over it regularly every night at nine o'clock.

But whilst my body, Madam, was thus disposed of, my spirit (as when alive) was still hovering, though invisible, round your Majesty, anxious for your welfare, and watching to do you any little services that lay within my power.

On Monday, whilst you walked, *my shade* still turned on the side of the sun to guard you from its beams.

On Tuesday morning, at breakfast, I brushed away a fly that had escaped Teed's[31] observation, and was just going to be the taster of your chocolate.

On Wednesday in the afternoon I took off the chilness of some strawberry-water your Majesty was going to drink, as you came in hot from walking; and at night I hunted a bat out of your bed-chamber, and shut a sash just as you fell asleep, which your Majesty had a little indiscreetly ordered Mrs. Purcel[32] to leave open.

---

[30] At Redlynch, in Somersetshire, whence he had visited Lord Poulet at Hinton.

[31] One of the Queen's attendants.

[32] The Queen's dresser and ordinary attendant.

On Thursday, in the drawing-room, I took the forms and voices of several of my acquaintance, made strange faces, put myself into awkward postures, and talked a good deal of nonsense, whilst your Majesty entertained me very gravely, *raccommoded* me very graciously, and laughed at me internally very heartily.

On Friday (being post-day) I proposed to get the best pen in the other world for your Majesty's use, and slip it invisibly into your standish, just as Mr. Shaw[33] was bringing it into your gallery for you to write, and accordingly I went to *Voiture* and desired him to lend me his pen, but when I told him for whom it was designed, he only laughed at me for a blockhead, and asked me if I had been at Court for four years to so little purpose as not to know that your Majesty had a much better of your own.

On Saturday I went on the shaft of your Majesty's chaise to Richmond; as you walked there I went before you, and with an invisible wand I brushed the dew and the worms out of your path all the way, and several times uncrumpled your Majesty's stocking.

This very day at chapel I did your Majesty some service, by tearing six leaves out of the parson's sermon, and shortening his discourse six minutes.

Your Majesty sees how ready I am to boast of the small services I am capable of doing you: but little geniuses must submit to little occupations, and those who wish to do you any services, if they are not able to do you all they would, must at least perform all they can; and if your Majesty thinks, after this purgatory I have gone through, I deserve my reward, do but pronounce my sentence, and say *Je vous laisse vivre*, my revival will immediately ensue, and the life of your presence be again enjoyed by, Madam, &c.—HERVEY.

---

[33] Mr. John Shaw, one of the pages of the back stairs.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

Speech of Lord Hervey in moving the Address in the House of Lords on the 17th of January, 1734.— See ante, p. 278.[1]

My Lords,

I am so new to the honour of sitting in this assembly, that very few occasions could offer in which I should not much sooner wish to be attentive in order to form my opinion than forward to deliver it.

But as many opportunities have presented themselves to your Lordships (which you have never failed to improve) of testifying your affection and duty to his Majesty's person and Government, your zeal for the service of the State, your attachment to its interest, and your resolution to protect and defend all the rights, liberties, and *privileges* of this wise and happy Constitution, of which your Lordships are the chief support and guardians; as your Lordships have not only at all times professed these to be your sentiments, but proved they were the principles that constantly actuate your conduct, I hope I shall be forgiven if, in order to follow such laudable examples, an extreme, and what on every other occasion I should call an improper, eagerness now prompts me to make the earliest declarations to your Lordships that, in these particulars at least, how deficient soever I am ready to confess myself in every other, I will never prove unworthy of being

[1] I think the two speeches here given will refute the character of "*florid impotence*" given to Lord Hervey's speeches by Pope, and repeated by Smollett. The truth is, his speeches were by no means florid, and are as well reasoned as any others of the period that have reached us.

admitted into this great society of which I have now the honour to be a member.

What encourages me still farther to hope for your Lordships' indulgence on this occasion is, that considering the present situation of England, either with regard to its foreign or domestic interest, considering what has just now been delivered from the Throne, and considering the characters of those to whom I am speaking, it is impossible for me not to imagine that every one of your Lordships is already desirous to promote what I shall only have the good fortune to be the first in proposing, and consequently whilst I am speaking my own thoughts I cannot help flattering myself that I am only anticipating and delivering the thoughts of your Lordships.

And as general acknowledgments to his Majesty for the regard he has on all occasions shown for the welfare of his subjects and the interests of these realms as expressing a gratitude for his past and a reliance on his future care, and a thorough satisfaction in his wise and prosperous government—as this is all I shall take the liberty to propose to your Lordships, many words, I think, cannot be necessary; a very few reflections on the series of policy pursued from the commencement of his Majesty's reign to this hour, a very short deduction of known facts, will surely suffice to prove the propriety of such a proposal at this time and the reasonableness of hoping for your Lordships' concurrence in it.

That peace is the essence of prosperity to a trading nation I believe is a position will no more be denied me than that the whole tenor of his Majesty's conduct since he first mounted the throne has demonstrated his desire, on one continued uniform plan, to procure that invaluable blessing to his people, and establish it on as lasting a foundation as human prudence can form, or the natural vicissitude and instability of human affairs subject to so many and such unforeseen accidents will admit.

The very delicate and unsettled situation in which his Majesty found the affairs of Europe at his first accession to the Crown; the unwearied application and unalterable steadiness with which he has wrought in order to fix them on a firmer foot; the success that did attend those endeavours and does still attend them with regard to the particular tranquillity

and prosperity of his own dominions, are considerations which, if duly weighed, will, I am convinced, not only entitle him to the thanks of all those of whose interests he has the care and of whose security he is the guardian, but must likewise procure him at least the tacit applause and approbation of all mankind.

As to the first of these considerations, I need not trouble your Lordships with particularly describing the very intricate, complicated, and entangled disposition of the affairs of all the great powers of Europe at the period I have just now mentioned. The various views and conflicting pretensions, the jarring demands and contradictory claims, of the different princes concerned in the disputes at that time depending, sufficiently set forth the difficulty of the part his Majesty had then to act. Nor were the immediate and particular interests of England unaffected. At this time there was a union subsisting between two great confederated powers, a union grounded on reciprocal advantages proposed to each other, which were to be gained by mutual aids stipulated, and assistance promised, not only in opposition to the interests of the British nation, but in manifest invasion of her absolute and established rights; I mean, my Lords, by one of these powers bringing again into dispute the possessions of England abroad (confirmed to us by so many treaties), whilst the other endeavoured to lessen the advantages of our trade by interfering in one of the most valuable and beneficial branches of it.

However, by the steady conduct, the firmness, and prudence of his Majesty, peremptory as these powers were in their demands, and stiff in maintaining what they had undertaken, means were found to baffle these attacks and defeat these pretensions; the rights and possessions of England abroad were again confirmed by a new treaty and agreements with one of these powers, the rival of our trade was no longer supported by the other, and the full exercise of every other branch of our commerce was again restored and amply enjoyed.

Nor did his Majesty's labours for the service of mankind end there; he now took into his thoughts the general peace of Europe, though he made it a second consideration to that of the particular interest of his own subjects, and postponed all

other views till that was accomplished. By his wise mediation and friendly interposition the tranquillity of Europe was restored; points that had been disputed during many years of unsuccessful negotiation were, by his skill, happily adjusted and settled; points that had so long kept all Europe in that uneasy situation of impending rupture, that amphibious state of war and peace, by which every country concerned was plunged in all the expenses of the one, yet detained in all the inaction of the other. However, such was the good fortune of his Majesty, that to this long-disturbed prospect succeeded an entire calm: Spain was satisfied, the Emperor was made easy, Holland consented, and France was quiet.

But as the best concerted schemes are still imperfect, and the most permanent liable to change, so, by accidents impossible to be foreseen, and consequences of those accidents as impossible, perhaps, to be prevented, though they had been foreseen, new troubles began, new clouds arose, and a new storm broke out upon the Continent. The choice of a successor to the deceased King of Poland employed the attention of all the great powers of Europe—an event about which it was natural to imagine the princes who at present dispute upon it would never have so far concerned themselves as to risk what they now stake and expose.

But it happened among them, as it often happens among people of inferior rank, that what was a trifle in the beginning became in the conclusion an essential: they engaged themselves unwarily by little and little till they found they were advanced too far to recede; what was not a point of interest at first became a point of honour at last, and they perceived themselves too late in that situation into which (if they had foreseen the inconveniences) they never would have brought themselves by the original embarking.

However, I cannot but observe to your Lordships that, whilst most countries in Europe are exposed to the calamities of war, and groan under its weight—whilst every country is sensible of the oppressive expenses of it—this island, still happy in her situation, nor less happy in her guardian and protector, by the caution, prudence, and foresight of his Majesty in the engagements by which he has bound himself, has still her

choice of peace or war, what party she will espouse, if any, whom she will assist, and whom she will withstand.

Her friendship by every State courted and coveted; her enmity by every Court dreaded and apprehended; her commerce, the source of her prosperity, extended to all parts of the known world, successful and unmolested; her ships laden with riches, every sea free to their passage and open to their reception.

And as this scene of happiness, the being prosperous at home and considerable abroad, as every blessing we can boast of, in my opinion, proceeds from the harmony subsisting between his Majesty and his Parliament, so I am persuaded it is wholly unnecessary for me to recommend to your Lordships the preservation of that harmony, as your own thoughts will naturally suggest to you that the best and surest method to continue these blessings and advantages to the state is to continue the means by which they have been procured.

And as the best security for the fidelity of alliances is to make it as much their interest by whom national faith is plighted to have it preserved as theirs to whom it is given—as the best security against any perfidious attacks upon our rights or invasions of our tranquillity is to show those who may meditate any such design how unsuccessful it is like to prove, and that the assailant would be the sufferer, and, in few words, my Lords, that we may depend as much on the fear as the faith of all our neighbours, I doubt not but your Lordships will think it expedient to put the nation in such a posture of defence as shall, in these general troubles and commotions, preserve the honour and dignity of the Crown from any insult, the safety of the people from any danger, and the peace of the kingdom from any at least successful attempts to molest it. Such steps are, I think, what prudence, interest, justice, and wisdom now require from your Lordships; such steps are consequently consistent with yourselves; and as I cannot help thinking that the proceedings of your Lordships have been such that the best rule for your future behaviour is the example of your past conduct, so I shall take the liberty to make a motion to your Lordships drawn as near as I could copy it upon that plan.

No. II.

Speech of Lord Hervey on the Petition of the Scotch Lords, on the 21st of February, 1735—ante, p. 480.

My Lords,

Though the motion I intend to make would, I think, be sufficiently warranted by the resolution your Lordships have just now come to, as it is, in my opinion, the natural and unavoidable consequence of that resolution; yet, as I always desire to justify in the most ample manner any proposal I ever take the liberty to make to your Lordships, so, before I give my opinion on the step your Lordships ought next to take, I shall beg your indulgence whilst in the shortest and clearest manner I am able I just state the progressive steps of this whole affair from its first rise to the present time, since it is on that very extraordinary gradation, and the collected and compared circumstances of so uncommon a proceeding, that I found that motion which I shall afterward have the honour to make.

I need not be very particular in describing the almost universal flame raised in the nation at the time when the election of the sixteen peers now sitting with your Lordships was made; the bare naming of the remarkable era will bring back to the memory of every Lord who now hears me the stories that were then in the mouths of most people, and in the ears of all, of the *enormous corruption*, the flagrant illegality, and even of the unwarrantable violences made use of in this transaction.

What effect the propagating these reports over the whole island produced in the minds of the people, your Lordships are equally well apprised of; for, notwithstanding the majority for the sixteen Lords now sitting in this House was so great that, taking out of the sixteen each list who voted for themselves,

the proportion, at a medium, between the two lists appeared to be as 42 to 9, yet it was currently reported, and by many believed, that the return was made in favour of the sixteen now sitting by the weight of power, and contrary to all the right of a free election.

In order to spread, strengthen, and confirm this opinion, *pamphlets* of the Protests made at the Scotch election were written and dispersed over the whole United Kingdoms to assert this fact, and to declare the return unduly made: I mean not by these pamphlets the anonymous scandal of sixpenny books, or the yet cheaper calumny of weekly or daily journals; but pamphlets of far superior authority, with great and noble names affixed to them, and not in the manner that many great and noble names are used—covertly described, or hinted at by initial letters, but written at length, and consequently in such manner as those who made use of them, had they not been authorised, would have been punished for so doing, or at least disavowed.

In these pamphlets the election for the sixteen returned was declared void and null, and a return claimed for the other list; a declaration was made, equally attested, that several Lords had voted for these sixteen unduly returned who had no right to vote, and that several others who had a right to vote were induced, by a corrupt influence, to make use of that right in favour of the Lords now sitting. To these assertions were added that of a capacity of proving them at a proper time and in a proper place: as everybody understood that proper time to be the meeting of the Parliament, and that proper place the great Assembly to which I am now speaking, the whole world was impatient till that interval between the election and the meeting of the Parliament was expired, and big with expectation to have these illegal and unjust practices set forth before the proper judges, that the practisers of them might be punished and the injured be redressed.

And as there could be but two reasons for believing this return had been made unduly—the one the notoriety of the facts, the other the concluding it from the unfitness of those returned to enjoy the honour of representing the Peerage of Scotland; and as no one could think the last, so every one concluded it

must be the first: and since I have mentioned this circumstance, I must beg leave, in justice to the sixteen Lords who are sitting here, to ask, unless undue influence manifestly had appeared and could be proved, why it should be supposed to have been necessary, to procure a choice of representatives for the Peerage of Scotland which the whole world must own to be so properly made? If birth, if rank, if ancient families, if property, if honour, if *integrity*, if blameless and unexceptionable characters can give man a claim to the honour of representing the Peerage of Scotland, where can sixteen more proper for that honour be found? I will not enter into the copious theme of the particular merits of each of these Lords, because what is so well known to your Lordships is unnecessary to be repeated, and because encomiums of that kind, I am sensible, must be disagreeable to those Lords themselves, as such praise is always most uneasy to the ears of those by whom it is most deserved.

To return, then, to what happened at the meeting of the Parliament, when all mankind expected these tales that had been circulated through the kingdom should be brought to some point; when it was expected that general assertions would be reduced to particular facts, that general invectives would be thrown into particular accusations, and general complaints brought home to particular delinquents—how were these expectations of mankind answered? The Parliament had been sitting near a month before any complaint at all was brought; and at last, when a complaint was made that seemed to be rather extorted by the expectations of the public than founded on just cause of complaint—when a petition was presented by the complainants, how was that petition signed, and what did it contain? It was *signed only by six Lords* of all those who had before thought themselves aggrieved; no direct proof, I own, that the rest had, on deliberation and better information, changed their opinion; but no very unnatural cause, sure, to believe that they had done so? for if these six Lords, thinking themselves duly elected, complain as candidates of a return made in their wrong, why are the names of the other ten, who are in the same situation, not added to these? If the petitioners complain of wrong done them as *electors*, why are not the names of nineteen more in the

same situation added to these? And can it be thought any unfair interpretation, any forced construction of this circumstance, to say it ought to be presumed that those who would have been partakers in the injury suffered, if there had been any, by not joining in the complaint on maturer deliberation, are convinced, notwithstanding their first thoughts, that there has no injury been done, and that there is no ground for complaint?

So much I could not help saying with regard to the manner of signing this petition. As to the matter contained in it, it is so far from reducing generals to particulars, it comes so far short of the substance of former complaints, and is conceived in such loose, indeterminate, ambiguous terms, that no one particular crime or criminal is mentioned in the complaint; yet at the same time such extensive terms of complaint used in this petition, that I think there is no species of crime that may not be covertly comprehended in it.

Notwithstanding, therefore, *the rebuke* I met with[1] in the first debate on this petition for calling this petition an *unintelligible* one, I shall persist in the expression, and think myself warranted in doing so by the best authority I can have, which is the authority of this House; for if the House thought this petition wanted explanation, it is evident it was unintelligible to them as well as to me; nay, it was unintelligible even in the most material point, which was the right of the sixteen Lords returned to their seats in this House. An explanation, therefore, of this point was ordered by the House to be made by the petitioners. And here I must make use of another word formerly objected to me, by calling this permission of explaining allowed to the petitioners an *indulgence* towards them; since, without the most particular regard to the rank and merit of the noble persons who signed this petition, and a desire to come to the bottom of reports that had made so much noise in this island, I presume your Lordships would not in common cases think yourselves obliged to be counsel to petitioners at your bar to make that intelligible at last which all petitioners ought to make so at first, or to reduce that to a practicable form which,

[1] From my Lord Gower and Lord Abington.—*Note by Lord Hervey.*

without your Lordships' assistance, was absolutely incapable of being proceeded upon at all; and for these reasons I called, and continue to call, this petition, as originally presented, not only a petition of an extraordinary and *unintelligible* nature, but one to which your Lordships have shown extraordinary marks of *indulgence*.

And notwithstanding former declarations made by those who had signed this petition, that the election for the sixteen returned Peers was null and void, the first explanation made by the petitioners upon your Lordships' order was,—*that they did not so much as contest the right of the sixteen, or any one of them, nor mean in any way to controvert their seats in this House*.

This explanation naturally and necessarily drew on another; for as this explanation only discharged the petition of one part of its ambiguity, your Lordships were obliged to require a further explanation of what facts were complained of, and by whom those facts were committed—an order which I beg leave to say was so far from being a hardship on the petitioners, that it is a direct compliance with part of the prayer of their petition; for as the Noble Lords, your petitioners, do say, after general complaints made, that they are able to lay *instances and proofs* before your Lordships of these general complaints in the manner you shall be pleased to direct, what is your order but a compliance with their request, and desiring that to be done which they affirm they are able and willing to do?

Nor can I help thinking that even this order was a second mark of your Lordships' *indulgence*, notwithstanding the offence taken at my making use of that word; for, had a petition of the like nature been presented to the House of Commons (the only case that can justly be compared to this)—had a petition, I say, from any electors been presented there, declaring that such petition did not mean to dispute the seat of the sitting Member, it is indisputable that the House of Commons would immediately have rejected it. Would the House of Commons (the right of the sitting Member uncontested) ever have admitted any number of the electors to come and give a *narrative* only of what had passed at the election? Would the House of

Commons admit any person or number of persons to come and recount at their bar particular circumstances of transactions at an election that were declared not in any manner to affect the seat of any of their Members? Would the House of Commons give any attention to petitioners who only came and said in general terms—We have been informed that some things have been done by some persons somewhere, which, if examined into, we believe might be of use to the House to know; though what has been done, where, or by whom, we are unable to inform you? Does anybody imagine that in the House of Commons any further notice would be taken of such a petition than to reject it? or will anybody say that, if the Commons were to treat petitions of this sort in any other manner—that, considering the number of elections that go to the constituting their body, their whole seven years must not be entirely taken up in hearing them, if any regard at all was paid to the purport of them?

The second order, therefore, which your Lordships gave to your petitioners, I do say was a further indulgence, as well in the substance of it as in (the Lords' petitioners written to by the Lord Chancellor, by order of the House) *the manner* by which both this and the former order were conveyed; a manner denoting such particular regard for the Noble Lords, your petitioners, that no example throughout all your journals can be found of a compliment of the like nature.

I shall not here enter into any vindication of this your Lordships' second order directing the petitioners to specify the facts complained of under the general terms of *undue methods and illegal practices*, and the names of the persons by whom such *undue methods and illegal practices* were used; the equity of that order, from all the principles of natural justice, and from the customs of all courts of judicature in all countries and all ages, to avoid hearing any criminal prosecution *ex parte*, was sufficiently demonstrated in the long debate that preceded the making of that order; I shall therefore now consider only in what situation the noncompliance with that order has put your Lordships, and cursorily take notice of the answer made to that order.

A noble Lord (Lord Anglesey) has been pleased to say that

it was not in the power of the petitioners to comply with this order; but I beg leave to observe, that in so saying the Noble Lord alleges that for the petitioners which they have not in their answer alleged for themselves. The petitioners do not say that they are under an inability to comply with your Lordships' order, but they say they cannot comply with it unless they will submit to be accusers, which they never designed to be: this answer, therefore, evidently implies that, if they would submit to be accusers, they could comply with your order; and indeed, my Lords, the nice distinction made by the petitioners between informers and accusers is a distinction which I know but one way to solve; and that is this,—if the information they intend to give your Lordships be an information of no criminal fact, it may certainly be an information without being an accusation; but then it will, I presume, be thought no very material information, and consequently not worth employing much of your Lordships' time: but if the information be consistent with every other part of their proceedings and declarations, either at the time of the election or since, it must not only be an accusation, but an accusation of the strongest nature. And though another Noble Lord (Lord Chesterfield) was pleased to say the petitioners never designed to name persons, and were not able to say what persons were concerned in the transactions they complain of, I must beg leave to answer, that, though *in some papers* I have already mentioned (the Scotch Lords' Protest), they have not actually named persons, yet they have so described persons that, if they cannot be justified in naming them when ordered by your Lordships, I am sure they are much less to be justified in having voluntarily so described them that every man in England knows who they mean, whilst the petitioners themselves are conscious they cannot make out what is there laid to the charge of those persons.

Another Noble Lord (Lord Bathurst) says the petitioners only desire your Lordships to go into an inquiry, and argues upon the reasonableness of your going into that inquiry without insisting on a specification of facts and persons, from these two examples:—Suppose (says he) *a man comes to a justice of the peace and tells him, Here has been a murder committed; a*

corpse lies bleeding and butchered in the street, and we desire your warrant to search for the murderer. Would the justice of peace say, No, I will not give my warrant till you name the man you would search for? To this supposition of the Noble Lord's I answer—No. Certainly the justice of the peace would not delay an inquiry; but in this case the fact, at least, is evident; and there is that wide difference between the supposed case and the present case, that in the one there is no doubt of the murder having been committed, whilst in the other there is no more certainty of the murder than there is of the murderer.

The other example the Noble Lord brought was the inquiry your Lordships made two years ago into the South Sea affair; to which I cannot help saying that I have often heard that all parallels limp a little; but this parallel, my Lords, has not one leg to go upon; for in the South Sea affair both facts and persons were named: the fact was the embezzling or misapplying the public money, the persons were those who had embezzled or misapplied it; and those persons who had done so (if it were done) could only be the Directors of the South Sea Company, who were immediately, in the first step of this proceeding, acquainted with the charges, and ordered to prepare their defence.

These examples, therefore, though brought as parallels to the present case, I think, on examination, plainly appear to be no parallels at all. But this Noble Lord, and another (Lord Bathurst and Lord Anglesey) who spoke just after him in the debate on the last question (which is so blended with the present question that it is impossible to separate them), did desire your Lordships would consider yourselves in the double capacity of legislators and judges, and that it was as much the business of this House to provide against wrongs that may be committed, as to punish wrongs that have been committed. I join with those Lords, and admit that your Lordships may act either in a legislative or a judicial capacity; but I am far from thinking that in these two capacities your manner of proceeding ought not to be extremely different. When your Lordships act as legislators, you will, as all legislators ought to do, consider the depravity of mankind—the iniquity of mankind by their propensity to commit wrong; and your Lordships in that

case will act in such a manner as to obviate, by salutary and preventive laws, the evils that may be apprehended to flow from those qualities in mankind, if unrestrained and unintimidated. But though in your legislative capacity you are to conclude all mankind, considered in gross, bad and prone to evil, yet, in your judicial capacity, I beg leave to say you are to conclude just the reverse. When you come in that capacity to sit upon particulars, you are to conclude every man good till he is proved to be bad, and are to take it for granted he has done right till it is manifested that he has done wrong; but to what purpose are your Lordships to make that conclusion if you will proceed in such a manner to try such persons, that, let their innocence be ever so clear, they can have no power to show that innocence at the time it is called in question? and how can they have that power if the prosecution is heard *ex parte?*

I know it will be answered that a time will be given to the accused to make their defence; but to apply that answer to the present case,—if the petitioners, who have had this prosecution in view these seven or eight months, still want a month longer to prepare their evidence, how much time after that may be necessary for the persons accused to prepare proper evidence for their defence? My Lords, there must such a singularity attend this manner of proceeding, that the more innocent those persons are who are accused, the more difficult it will be for them to make their defence; for those who were conscious of having done wrong might, by the suggestions of their own consciences, have some light to direct them what path they ought to take for their defence, whereas those who are conscious of no wrong committed would be entirely in the dark.

What, then, would be the state of those persons who in the course of this manner of proceeding should stand charged with any criminal practice? Their accusers would be heard *ex parte* at your Lordships' bar; witnesses produced whose characters, as well as the matter of their evidence, might perhaps be objected to (if there was an opportunity) by those they charge: a calumniating history might be plausibly told; and this history, under an impossibility during a long interval of being refuted, would be circulated through the whole kingdom; and though

hereafter perhaps no assertion in this charge would be better supported when it came to be examined than the assertion made in Scotland of the election for the sixteen being void, yet to everybody in the interim those assertions would be told: by the credulous they would be believed; by the malignant they would be improved; by the discontented they would be attested; and by the clamorous they would be trumpeted and inculcated through the whole kingdom; whilst the light the House of Lords would then stand in must be, abetting, by the in-equity of their proceedings, the factious clamours of those whom they ought rather to censure and punish.

Nay, I will go still further: perhaps even this House itself might partake of this dangerous taint; for though your Lordships' justice and candour would prevent your doing any corporate act, or giving any corporate opinion, on a cause heard in this manner *ex parte*, yet who can answer for the involuntary conviction of his own private opinion, or say that, after hearing one side, making a formal accusation supported by evidence (which always bears some appearance of proof), that he will or can suspend his belief till he hears what can be said on the other? and how many plausible falsehoods does everybody every day hear advanced, to which, till the answer is heard, it is imagined there can be none!

Upon the whole, my Lords, as your Lordships from the original rise of this complaint to the present hour have seen this complaint on every explanation grow weaker and weaker; that these representations of monstrous enormities and injustices committed at the Scotch election, like stories of witches and ghosts, though eagerly and generally received by the vulgar at first, have lost their credit the nearer they have been traced and the more nicely they have been examined and sifted; as the petition is so much weaker than the first general assertions, and every explanation of the petition so much weaker than the petition itself; as your Lordships have endeavoured to throw what was presented impracticable into a practicable form; as you gave an order for that purpose, and have just come to a resolution that that order has been disobeyed; I think the single question remaining for your Lordships to consider is, whether you will adhere to your own order or recede from it—whether

you will direct your petitioners in what manner they shall speak, or whether they shall dictate to your Lordships in what manner you shall hear: and as your Lordships, after this refusal to obey your order, cannot possibly, without receding from it, proceed upon this petition; and as you cannot recede from that order, so deliberately and equitably made, either consistently with your honour or your justice, my humble motion to your Lordships is, *That the petition be dismissed.*

[*It is stated in p.* 483 *that Lord Hervey's speech on the number of the forces,* 1735, *would be given in the Appendix; but I find it so long, and the topics so obsolete, that I think the reader will be satisfied with the two specimens of his Lordship's parliamentary oratory above given. I must add, however, that this other speech is a grave and statesmanlike argument, and as unlike the character that Pope and Smollett give of Lord Hervey's speaking as it is possible to conceive.*]

END OF VOL. I.

London: Printed by William Clowes and Sons, Stamford Street.

3 2044 010 011 880

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.

DEC 1